DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 123 SP 022 978

TITLE	A Case for Educational Restructuring. Conference at Simon's Rock of Bard College (Great Barrington, Massachusetts, January 1981).
INSTITUTION	Simon's Rock of Bard Coll., Great Barrington, MA.
SPONS AGENCY	Braitmayer Foundation, Boston, Mass.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jan 81
NOTE	93p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Development Office, Simon's Rock of Bard College, Great Barrington, MA 01230.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Acceleration (Education); *College School Cooperation; *Early Admission; Educational Change; Educational Quality; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Students; Student Development; *Student Needs; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Restructuring

ABSTRACT

This document reports the proceedings of a conference entitled, "The Case for Educational Restructuring," which was designed to re-examine values and assumptions underlying the traditional structure of secondary and postsecondary education. The central concern of the conference was to make a case for the formulation of a national, comprehensive youth policy which would foster access to higher education opportunities based on readiness rather than on chronological age. Major conference papers presented and included in this document are: (1) "Making a Mesh of Things: School-College Articulation" (Charles W. Meinert); (2) "Institutional Imperatives and Possibilities for Change" (Elizabeth Coleman); (3) "Educational Quality› Or Where is the Student in Educational Planning?" (Nancy R. Goldberger); (4) "Teacher Education: What is the Role of the Classroom and the Training for the Classroom?" (Janet E. Lieberman); (5) "Current Status of Youth Policy in Education and Prospects for the Future" (Michael Timpane); (6) "Early Exit" (Tommy M. Tomlinson); and (7) "Educational Restructuring in an Historical Perspective" (Leon Botstein). These proceedings also contain short summaries of two panel presentations, two observers' remarks, descriptions of seven model programs, biographies of presentors, and a list of participants. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236123

A CASE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

Conference at
Simon's Rock of Bard College
Great Barrington, Massachusetts

January 1981

SP 022 978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John M. Paskvs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BENEFACTORS

The Bard College Center

The Braitmayer Foundation

The Ford Foundation

The Fund for the Improvement
of Postsecondary Education

EDITORIAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Gene L. Mason

Susan Van Kleeck

John M. Paskus

Ann M. Filkins

©Copyright, Simon's Rock of Bard College, 1981.

Additional copies may be obtained by calling
or writing the Development Office,
Simon's Rock of Bard College,
Great Barrington, MA 01230.

CONTENTS

PREFACE 5

AGENDA 9

MAJOR PAPERS

Making a Mesh of Things: School-College Articulation—Charles W. Meinert 15

Institutional Imperatives and Possibilities for Change—Elizabeth Coleman 24

Educational Quality: Or Where is the Student in Educational Planning?—Nancy R. Goldberger 30

Teacher Education: What is the Role of the Classroom and the Training for the Classroom?—Janet E. Lieberman 35

Current Status of Youth Policy in Education and Prospects for the Future—Michael Timpane 39

Early Exit—Tommy M. Tomlinson 43

Educational Restructuring in an Historical Perspective—Leon Botstein 47

PANELS

Agencies' Perspectives on Educational Restructuring 56

Early vs. Delayed Admission to College 57

OBSERVERS' REMARKS

Franklin Patterson 59

Elizabeth B. Hall 60

MODEL PROGRAMS

Matteo Ricci College 62

Middle College High School 63

The New School for Social Research 66

The North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics 67

Project Advance 68

School-College Articulation Project 70

Simon's Rock 73

BIOGRAPHIES 79

PARTICIPANTS 88

PREFACE

CONFERENCE RATIONALE AND RESOLUTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

On January 13-15, 1981, Simon's Rock of Bard College in cooperation with the Ford Foundation, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, the Braitmayer Foundation, and the Bard College Center held a conference, "The Case for Educational Restructuring," designed to re-examine the values and assumptions underlying the traditional structure of secondary and postsecondary education. The central concern of the conference was to make a case for educational restructuring and to consider possibilities for the formulation of a national, comprehensive youth policy which would foster access to higher education opportunities based on readiness rather than chronological age. The conference was unanimous and clear in seeing a need for such a youth policy to challenge the rigidities of an inadequate traditional structure which prescribes four years of secondary school prior to admission into a collegiate environment. Members of the conference pointed to the wastefulness of intellectual energies, time and money inherent in this traditional structure and to the need for exploration into new strategies to enhance the options for students to vary the pattern of their education. While the participants were cautious in moving toward the formation of a comprehensive youth policy, they were quick to see the need for a continuing and coordinated effort in this direction. What follows here in the introduction is a brief description of the rationale for the conference and an outline of plans for future work resulting from this year's meetings. More complete discussions of specific issues are contained in the papers and remarks by conference participants in succeeding pages.

There are few generalizations in education that are universally agreed upon, but one of them is that people learn at different rates and possess differing aptitudes. It is critical to realize that present education systems and public policies, presumably dedicated to providing the best education for all students, are so structured that they block effective means to accommodate these differences.

While almost every other structure in the United States has been replaced or remodelled as modernization required, education has remained fundamentally unaltered. It is a sequence established without regard for structural integrity. Children enter at the bottom and emerge at the top prepared, presumably to enter the adult world. By implication each higher level is more important than the lower; and also by implication, the higher the level attained by the student the more important his worth as an individual. Hence the race to the top and the growing tendency to emphasize competence in stair-climbing at the expense of individual development and a central goal of education, that all shall be matured along the way and made ready to take their places in the adult world. At a time when adolescents are reaching maturity earlier, the structure of education should be re-evaluated to more responsibly accommodate the changing needs of students.

Compounding the problem of structure is a series of curricula which do not respond to the rapidly changing educational needs of students. As noted in the Carnegie Commission report on higher education (*Less Time, More Options* - 1971) a deficiency of both high school and college is that two thirds of the last two years of high school and the first year of college in particular are repetitious. This fact suggests that we are wasting our students' time and talents. There is a tendency to encapsulate our youth in undemanding educational environments that reinforce many immature elements of their personalities. This, together with a lack of guidance geared to the cognitive development of individual students, produces a system which cannot accommodate excellence or identify educational needs. As a result, some of the most able students between the ages of 16 and 22 have helped to produce an astonishingly high drop-out rate in no small part due to boredom with unresponsive curricula.

Although there have been and continue to be isolated attempts to introduce greater flexibility in the educational structure, there remain obstacles to change from federal discrimination in scholarship guidelines to admissions bias in higher education related to age and degree completion. While resistance to change is largely based on a perceived economic self-interest, there is also a genuine lack of understanding among educators of the characteristics and needs of students who elect an early transition from high school to college. Imaginative leadership not bound to the traditional lockstep structure is required if significant options are to be developed.[1]

From the Hutchins' venture at the University of Chicago to the current proliferation of programs such as the Gifted Students Program at the Johns Hopkins University and other early admissions programs opportunities have existed for a few select students to begin collegiate study before completion of high school. Developmental psychologists note that young people mature earlier and enter college more knowledgeable than did students in the past. But with few available alternatives, many of these students who mature early opt out of formal education completely. The research on changing adolescent needs is indeed meager and recommendations to meet these changes have been few and, thus, have not made an impact on national education policy. Several states have passed laws allowing "early-out" examinations for secondary students, but the significant number of students who drop out without official sanction is indicative of the failure to address the public policy question of viable options for young adults.

It has been argued that early admissions programs do indeed respond to the need of adolescents for more options in education. However, it should be noted that these options are largely elitest in that they are usually designed for gifted young people from middle to upper class families. Thus, they do not significantly impact educational and social programs that affect minorities or the economically deprived—the very groups constituting a majority of young people who opt out of the conventional school sequence. The need to break the lockstep of an educational sequence which too often serves time rather than achievement has long been recognized by many. When the break from the traditional structure has occurred, however, it has in general not been to the benefit of the majority of those students who would profit from it.

Thus, the conference participants addressed issues which challenged the values and assumptions of the traditional structure by proposing alternatives to

it and by acknowledging the trend toward the diffusion of boundaries between high school and college.

To insure an effective conference, prominent national figures from business, government, public and private foundations and education were invited to offer their insights into issues of reform in education. Participants in the conference were selected from constituencies whose representatives are in a position to affect change or to be influenced by variations in the traditional structure. Those constituencies represented in the conference were college and university presidents, deans, and program heads; high school teachers and administrators; state education system representatives; foundation executives; tuition assistance groups; federal funding agencies; national association of colleges, national board members, and officials from existing alternative programs. The conference agenda and the work prepared for the conference by these participants is contained in the pages which follow along with specific program descriptions.

The conference generated a wealth of suggestions for future initiatives and numerous letters of positive response from participants and panelists. The most specific suggestion in addition to publishing the conference proceedings was to hold a second conference at Simon's Rock to continue the initial dialogue and expand the participants to include representatives from business and industry, teacher unions, parent organizations, and others. An additional and frequently mentioned recommendation from conference participants was that Simon's Rock in cooperation with other institutions develop a plan for a Resources Institute concerned with educational restructuring which would serve as an information, research and consultation center. Foundation representatives suggested brokering a proposal for funding such a center to several foundations.

In order to discuss further some of these suggestions, Nancy Goldberger of Simon's Rock, Wendy Shepard, Bard College Center, Janet Lieberman, LaGuardia Community College, Franklin Patterson, Center for Studies in Policy and Public Interest, University of Massachusetts, Daniel Yankelovich, Yankelovich, Skelly and White, and Arthur Greenberg, Middle College High School, met for an all-day session in New York City. The discussion was far-ranging and included consideration of varieties of resource centers and services. However, the consensus of the group was that Simon's Rock is in a unique position to lead a national conference concerned with the economic, social and technological changes that will contribute to the need for educational restructuring in the next two or three decades. Simon's Rock's record as a successful challenge to the educational structure and as a school that is responsive to the developmental needs of the students it serves places the College in a special and influential position in American education.

In view of this, it was suggested that Simon's Rock seek funding for a second conference on educational restructuring to be part of a series of annual conferences on educational change. The content of this second conference would focus on serving the needs of new student populations: women, Hispanics, immigrants, and unemployed youth among others. The whole spectrum of educational agencies would convene to discuss the range of options available for the new students currently. Consistent with Peter Drucker's thesis that the demand for education is not declining, only the demand for traditional education, the conference would critique the programs currently available and make recommendations for the kind of programs that need to be developed for the

new diversity. The core audience would include last year's participants as well as members of the corporate sector engaged in education. The conference would take place in June, 1982 at Simon's Rock.

A unique feature of the second conference and subsequent follow-up would be a series of regional conferences held during the year following the June conference. These regional conferences would be thematically related to the larger national conference, perhaps focused more on educational issues specific to the geographical region and population. A core planning committee would serve as consultants to supervise the regional conferences which would be organized by local institutions and personnel. It was suggested that some of the regional conferences might be organized through agencies such as the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and teachers unions. If the idea of an annual June conference is realized, these regional conferences could become a permanent feature. Funding for each national and regional conference sequence would vary, approaching different funding sources depending on the year's thematic focus.

Concomitant with the conference activities, and perhaps independently funded, would be the planning toward a more permanent Resource Institute on Educational Restructuring. During the 1981-82 year, a planning group will be established. During the initial planning year, the group can analyze and document the need for the continuing public discussion of educational change and restructuring. One suggestion was that this could best be accomplished by interviewing lay figures in education, industry and unions, etc. to begin to map out the variety of perspectives on American education in the future. This planning group would then describe the broad mandate, delineate the important issues around the topic of educational restructuring and make recommendations about the approach to best attack the need comprehensively. This blueprint document would then be used for further fund-raising to support activities of the Resources Institute. The planning group would also contract individuals to write two or three seminal articles on special issues related to change in the structure of education. These papers would also define the parameters of educational problems and outline potential strategies to address the discontinuity currently existing between providers and users of education.

The papers and remarks which follow represent an initial step in a serious attempt to affect change in education.

John M. Paskus

FOOTNOTES

[1]William Josephson and Bonnie Steingart have prepared papers which discuss in depth the issues involved with the legal obstacles to change in education. They address both constitutional and state judiciary responses to compulsory education and its relationship to the individual rights of citizens. While their papers were unavailable at the time of publication, copies of their work may be obtained upon request to the authors.

THE CASE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

The Implications of Early College Readiness
For National Youth Policy in Education

Simon's Rock of Bard College
Great Barrington, Massachusetts
January 13-15, 1981

AGENDA

Tuesday, January 13

12:30 LUNCHEON

Speaker: LEON BOTSTEIN, President, Simon's Rock and Bard College—"The Case for Educational Restructuring: An Historical Analysis"

2:15 - 3:30 PRACTITIONERS PANEL: Model Programs

CHARLES R. EILBER, North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics

GEORGE FOWLER, Central High School (OK)

ARTHUR GREENBERG, Middle College High School, La Guardia Community College (NY)

EILEEN T. HANDELMAN, Simon's Rock of Bard College

WARREN MCGREGOR, Manhasset Junior/Senior High School (NY)

RICHARD RICKARD, University School, School/College Articulation Program (OH)

EDWIN WEIHE, Matteo Ricci College-II (WA)

3:30 - 4:30 STUDENT PANEL: At the Front Line—Student Experience

FERENC CZEGLEDY, Manhasset High School
ANN DANIELS, New School for Social Research graduate
BRIAN R. HOPEWELL, Simon's Rock graduate
JULIA INSINGER, Simon's Rock
MARK SEALY, Middle College High School graduate

5:00 - 6:00 INFORMATION CENTERS for obtaining specific information on some of the models that have been developed to address the issue of early college readiness

Manhasset High School (NY)
Matteo Ricci College-II (WA)
Middle College High School (NY)

New School for Social Research (NY)
North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics
Project Advance, Syracuse University (NY)
School College Articulation Program (OH)
Simon's Rock of Bard College (MA)
Talent Identification Program, Johns Hopkins University (MD)

6:30 DINNER

Speaker: MICHAEL TIMPANE, Director, National Institute of Education—"Current Status of Youth Policy in Education and Prospects for the Future"

Wednesday, January 14

9:00 - 12:00 PANEL: Issues, Obstacles and Strategies in Educational Change

Moderator: FRANKLIN PATTERSON, Director of the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest and Boyden Professor, University of Massachusetts, Boston; Founding President, Hampshire College

I. The curriculum and content of education at the secondary and postsecondary level

MICHAEL O'KEEFE, Vice President for Policy Studies, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

II. Educational quality: Where is the student in educational planning?

NANCY R. GOLDBERGER, Director of Student Evaluation, Simon's Rock of Bard College

III. Teacher education: What is the role of the classroom and the training for the classroom?

JANET LIEBERMAN, Founder, Middle College High School, La Guardia Community College

IV. Admissions and recruitment: Who controls the flow of students from high school to the college level?

FRED R. BROOKS, JR., Director of Admissions, Vassar College

V. Institutional imperatives: What kinds of innovations are possible today?

ELIZABETH COLEMAN, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, New School for Social Research

12:00 LUNCHEON

Speaker: WILLIAM JOSEPHSON, Attorney, Fried,

Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson and BONNIE STEINGART, Associate, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson—"Legal and Financial Obstacles in Educational Change"

Respondent: ARTHUR GREENBERG, Middle College High School of Fiorella La Guardia Community College

2:30 - 3:30 WORKSHOPS: Issues, Obstacles and Strategies in Educational Restructuring

I. Early vs. delayed admission to college

RICHARD ZAJCHOWSKI, Assistant Director, DYNAMY

II. The origin and consequences of state early-exit exams

TOM TOMLINSON, Senior Associate, National Institute of Education

III. Relationship between learning and work

WILLIAM BIRENBAUM, President, Antioch University

IV. School/college articulation models: Lessons learned from past experiences

CHARLES MEINERT, Associate in Higher Education, State of New York

JOE MERCURIO, Associate Director, Project Advance, Syracuse University

3:45 - 4:45 PANEL: Agencies' Perspectives on Educational Restructuring

I. FEDERAL AGENCIES

Moderator: LIVINGSTON HALL, Former Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

ALBERT YOUNG, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, Science Education, National Science Foundation

TOM TOMLINSON, Senior Associate, Office of Special Studies, National Institute of Education

NANCY JO HOFFMAN, Program Officer, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

GEOFFREY MARSHALL, Director, Division of Education Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities

II. FOUNDATIONS

Moderator: GENE L. MASON, Vice President for

Development and Public Relations, Simon's Rock and Bard College

MICHAEL O'KEEFE, Vice President for Policy Studies, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

JOHN M. BAHNER, Director of Education, Charles F. Kettering Foundation

ARNOLD SHORE, Program Officer, The Exxon Education Foundation

III. ACCREDITING AGENCIES

Moderator: EILEEN T. HANDELMAN, Dean of Academic Affairs, Simon's Rock of Bard College

ROBERT KIRKWOOD, Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges

LYN GUBSER, Director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

ROBERT J. O'DONNELL, Director of Evaluation, Commission on Public Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges

5:00 - 6:00 INFORMATION CENTERS for obtaining information about special programs

5:00 - 6:00 COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIES: Closed meeting of workshop leaders to plan agenda for next morning

6:30 DINNER

7:30 - 8:30 Summary reports from invited observers who will focus on (1) unresolved questions regarding educational restructuring and (2) general themes and issues emerging from the conference

FRANKLIN PATTERSON, Director of the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest and Boyden Professor, University of Massachusetts, Boston; Founding President, Hampshire College

FREDERICK T. HALEY, Board of Advisors, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education; Founding Member, Citizens Education Center Northwest

ELIZABETH B. HALL, Founder and President Emerita, Simon's Rock

8:30 - 9:00 COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIES: Report on recommended focus for next morning workshops

Thursday, January 15

9:00 - 10:45 WORKSHOPS: Planning for Change—Specific Plans and Recommendations

11:00 - 12:30 PLENARY SESSION with reports back from morning workshops. Mechanisms for involving interested persons in continuing efforts will be defined.

MAJOR PAPERS

MAKING A MESH OF THINGS: SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

Charles W. Meinert

Charles W. Meinert has for ten years been an Associate in Higher Education with the Division of Academic Program Review, New York State Education Department. Mr. Meinert's work has centered on the issues of school-college articulation, and his presentation is a theoretical and historical appraisal of coordinated efforts to facilitate the development of students.

Articulation in postsecondary education can be characterized as a process, an attitude, and a goal. Articulation as a process coordinates policies and practices across a wide spectrum of activities to produce a smooth flow of students from one sector to another. Articulation as an attitude is exemplified by the willingness of educators in all sectors to work together to transcend individual and institutional self-interests that impede the maximum development of the student. Articulation as a goal would create an educational system without artificial and harmful divisions so that the whole educational period becomes one unbroken flow with the rate of that flow different for each individual.

An educational program, institution, or system is said to be well-articulated when there is a planned coordination of the major elements that facilitate the efficient and maximum development of the student. The term "articulation" to describe this educational concept was initially used in reference to the public school curriculum, focusing on the desirable relationship between subject areas at the same grade level and upon coordination between grades.

More recently, the term has been widely adopted in higher education to describe the desirable relationships that should exist between sectors of the American educational system. The matter is most serious in the period of grades 12 to 16 when millions of students are faced with the transition from high school to college, from community college to senior college, and from senior college to graduate or professional school. The concept has also expanded to include the coordination between formal educational sectors and the activities of proprietary institutions and quasi-educational organizations such as the military, business-industry, and community agencies.

Articulation, the interaction and coordination of educational sectors, is never completely absent or completely realized, but is rather on a continuum between the poles of a total lack of interaction or the complete absence of organizational or attitudinal distinctions. Current educational literature indicates, however, that many educators concerned with the topic of articulation in postsecondary education are critical of the existing fragmented system of education.

No educational system with a well-planned, coherent, and centrally directed

NOTE: Segments of this paper have been drawn from the author's article, "Articulation: United States," in the *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Jossey-Bass, 1977.

continuum exists. Most people in the United States tend to think of education in terms of schools or levels, such as elementary school, secondary school, community college, senior college, and graduate school.

The educational sectors have different origins, philosophies and educational styles. The kindergarten, elementary school, and graduate school followed a German model; the four-year college was based on the English practice, while the high school and community college were more indigenous in origin. These sectors also differ in focus and approach. Some focus on the general development of the child and the socialization process; some stress the development of democratic ideas and preparation for life; and others stress academic specialization. Some sectors deal with students in homogeneous groups and stress cooperative activities and close student-teacher relations. Other units are dominated by an emphasis on individual competitiveness and impersonal student-teacher relations. The operation of the various sectors is further complicated by society's commitment to both comprehensive and mass education. The comprehensive thrust seeks to provide for both academic and vocational needs within the same institution while the mass education impulse is an expression of the belief in man's capacity to develop his talents through education.

The commitment to education in the United States has been accompanied by a strong aversion to government planning and control. As a result, there is no national curriculum or coordinated system of education. The limited involvement of the federal government in education is exercised primarily by the appropriation of money for various educational purposes and the requirements imposed upon those who accept these funds. Federal funds, although important, have not been the primary source of support for higher education; there has been little attempt to control curriculum or stimulate cooperative activities. The federal role is also limited to the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution which gives legal authority for education to the individual states. States, in turn, have delegated much of their authority to local school boards with only limited guidance or requirements in elementary and secondary education from a state educational agency. States have historically exercised even less control over higher education. States incorporate educational institutions (often in a *pro forma* manner), and some state education agencies have established standards of minimum quality, but until recently, few have sought to coordinate educational sectors. In fact, the fragmented nature of postsecondary education is reflected in the common situation of many states having separate state boards or agencies to oversee various sectors such as community colleges, private colleges and universities, state colleges and universities, and technical or vocational schools. There has also been a strong tradition of private colleges and universities that are almost sovereign bodies in terms of policy, procedures and curriculum; public colleges and universities which are supported in part by state appropriations have been accorded great freedom to govern themselves.

The educational divisions have demonstrated great tenacity. A contemporary educator, Ernest Boyer, Commissioner of Education, has described American education as a giant layer cake, with each layer separated from the others by the icing of tradition (Boyer, 1975, p.20).

It is the extent and character of this icing of separation between the educational divisions, more than the existence of the sectors themselves, that

produces the harmful discontinuities that have been noted in a number of publications such as the 1973 Carnegie Commission report, *Continuity and Discontinuity: Higher Education and the Schools.*

There is, of course, some formal interaction between layers. Students move from the schools to the colleges, primarily in age group waves, while colleges prepare teachers and administrators to enter the schools. There are counselors at the schools and admissions officers at the universities who interact with each other; but at the instructional level, there is an enormous gap between professional educators in the two sectors. Faculty and staff at each level tend to have different programs for preparation and certification, belong to different professional associations, face different promotion and reward systems, and have somewhat different conceptions of their professional role.

There are relatively few legal obstacles to better interaction among educational sectors. The primary problem is lack of understanding between educators in the different sectors and the tendency to seek narrow institutional self-interest. These attitudes are reinforced by the lack of substantial contact between groups. It is unusual for a university professor, even one who teaches the introductory course in a discipline, to know any high school teacher who offers the most advanced high school courses in that same discipline. If a professor knows such a teacher, it is not likely that they manifest any substantial interest or knowledge of what and how the other is teaching students.

Even the terms used to describe the two sectors, secondary education and higher education, express hierarchial attitudes of a superior-inferior relationship rather than an educational community concept in which units may differ in function but are of equal and interdependent value.

The conditions of separation and the unhealthy attitudes about status, function, and control might be regrettable, but acceptable, if they only affected the professional staff. It is the student, however, who is penalized by the lack of understanding, cooperation, and coordination between educational sectors. Resulting discontinuities may deprive students of the assistance they need to maximize basic educational opportunities, handicap the attainment of educational excellence, and result in unnecessary fiscal expenditures.

The high school had its origins in the 19th century and came to provide an additional four years beyond the primary school which had expanded to seven or eight years. Secondary schools proliferated rapidly toward the end of the century and permitted colleges to upgrade enrollment expectations and curriculum by providing a larger pool of well-prepared youth.

As colleges embarked upon a system of meritocracy under the influence of the German model of academic specialization and excellence, they attempted to screen graduates of the high schools by unilateral college-constructed exams or by prescribing the high school curriculum. The high schools resisted becoming preparatory schools controlled by the colleges, and during the first half of the 20th century, a number of national committees and studies considered the questions of the control and function of the secondary school. The Committee of Ten in 1892 was dominated by college presidents and sought to impose a standard college preparatory curriculum on the schools (Menacker, 1975, p. 15). In 1910, the Committee of Nine, which was more representative of secondary school leaders, called for less rigid subject requirements for admission to college and pointed out that the public high school had broader responsibilities

than preparing students for college. Regional accrediting associations of schools and colleges were formed giving the high schools some voice in accreditation of schools and also developed external entrance examinations in subject areas.

An Eight Year Study in the 1930s demonstrated that students who graduate from less prescriptive high school programs could do well in college (Menacker, 1975, p. 17). Many colleges abandoned subject requirements and came to rely more heavily upon Scholastic Aptitude and similar tests which were based on a broader curriculum than the old external subject exams. College admissions practices were further liberalized to accommodate veterans returning from World War II and as part of the Cold War competition, two experiments were conducted in the 1950s to stimulate the development of talented high school students. The Advanced Placement Program created a number of college-level courses designed to be taught to talented students in the high school by secondary school faculty. The results of the student's performance on external exams in these courses would be reported to the college in which he enrolled and might result in the waiving of certain courses or even the awarding of college credit. During the same decade, a group of colleges admitted an experimental group of talented students who had not yet completed high school. The students were successful in all respects, but few colleges subsequently revised their admissions requirements or crediting practices to accommodate more than a handful of similar young people.

The effort of the public high school to maintain the freedom to determine its own curriculum was largely successful, but the struggle revealed fears and attitudes that have handicapped close cooperation between the two sectors. Current articulation problems are no longer focused primarily around selective admissions and prescribed curricula, but now involve problems of curriculum overlap meeting the needs of the educationally disadvantaged and providing flexible progression opportunities for able students who are not challenged by the senior year in high school.

There have been sporadic efforts to improve articulation. Progress was made under the leadership of educators with broad vision such as Eliot, Dewey, and Hutchins. They, and other reformers, struggled for change in an era of hostile and unfavorable circumstances. The prospects for improved articulation are considerably brighter today, however, for there are a number of forces that are pressing and encouraging educators in both school and college sectors to actively seek new and more productive relationships.

The following ten interrelated developments provide a variety of stimuli for closer cooperation between school and college. This is not an exhaustive list nor does it provide a full explication of any of these significant trends; but it is suggestive of the range of issues that are eroding the icing of tradition that has separated educational layers.

1. *Learner Centered Reform.* There is a movement at both the high school and college level toward non-traditional and more individualized approaches to education. This trend assumes that institutions should seek to meet the learning needs of the individual student by designing educational programs and opportunities that go beyond the traditional classroom setting, academic time frame, and modes of instruction. The new approaches recognize that there are different ways to learn, and that the rate of learning not only differs widely for individuals of the same age but that the same student may have varying

rates of achieving mastery in different fields of knowledge. Educators at both levels need to share in the experimentation and development associated with the new approaches and find ways that will permit students to utilize the appropriate resources of both systems no matter what class or grade designation they may possess.

2. *Open Admissions.* The movement to universal access or some form of open admissions is causing colleges to share the secondary schools' concern and responsibility for assisting students who are experiencing learning difficulties and are in need of some form of remediation or special assistance. Even colleges which continue to be highly selective in their admissions policies frequently have special quotas or programs for educationally disadvantaged students.

Most institutions which addressed these students have ceased to blame others for the problem and have begun to develop cooperative programs to eliminate the difficulties. Clearly, there is a need to share wisdom and experience so that results of approaches to strengthen basic skills can be assessed.

3. *The Urban Crisis.* Although this issue involves the basic skills problem, it is considerably broader and includes issues of racial attitudes, ethnic concerns, poverty, and unemployment. These are not e[illegible]ly educational concerns in the narrow sense of the term, but they certai[illegible], affect the elementary and secondary schools of the cities.

Although realistic about the difficulty of these problems and cautious about quick solutions, colleges and universities in urban settings are increasingly cognizant of their obligation to provide assistance to the public school system. The president of a university in Boston expressed this view when he noted that the colleges and universities in that area are coming to recognize "that they cannot have the school system of the former Athens of America in disarray and expect to maintain happy prospects for higher Education" (Hoyle, 1975, p. 22).

Educators from both levels need to confront the questions of what skills a teacher needs to function in this setting and how teacher preparation and in service training can provide the necessary background. Joint efforts are also needed to rethink the content and organization of the curriculum and the system of governance of the schools.

4. *"Senioritis".* This is a growing phenomenon in many suburban schools and in some special urban schools. It is characterized by restlessness, boredom, and lack of challenge or motivation and affects a large number of able secondary school seniors or even juniors. There are a number of causes for this condition. A growing number of students have completed or nearly completed graduation requirements by the end of the junior year and are "marking time" waiting for entrance into college. Other students are not motivated by traditional schedules and procedures, and some students with special talents do not find appropriate courses or programs.

There is no single solution to these difficulties; however, cooperative efforts between school and college might alleviate much of this unproductive tension and permit a significant number of able students to be stimulated and challenged.

5. *Earlier Maturity.* A number of research studies report that young people are physically, socially, and intellectually more advanced than were their parents at the same age.

"Since the turn of the century, the average amount of educa-

tion received by each student group has increased by approximately one year per decade. Also, the average age for the onset of puberty has decreased by approximately one standard deviation above the average student of the same age a generation ago. . . . Translated into individual terms, this means that the average 16-year old of today, compared with the 16-year old of 1920, would probably have reached puberty one year earlier, have received . . . more education, and be performing intellectually at the same level as a 17 or 18-year old in 1920." (Kenniston, 1970, p. 118).

This earlier maturing has been recognized by more liberal parietal rules, expanded student participation in governing boards, and by reduction of the voting age. The current system of separate educational layers, however, has not adequately responded. One suggestion has been the creation of a middle or intermediate college which would better accommodate the needs of the 16-19 age group than the current division at age 17.

6. *Youth to Adulthood.* Not only are young people maturing earlier, they are spending an increasing number of years in the educational system for a number of reasons, but primarily because their labor has become unnecessary.

> In consequence, the schools and colleges have come to provide the general social environment for youth. The world of the maturing child, formerly dominated by the home, is now monopolized on the formal level by the school but the school system, as now constituted, offers an incomplete context for the accomplishment of many important facets of maturation (Coleman, 1974, p. 2).

The education system does reasonably well with the cognitive skills necessary for economic independence; however, more attention is needed to making individuals effective in the management of their own affairs and more experienced in interacting with different socio-economic and age groups.

The education system might expand the role of a young person beyond that of student in a number of ways including the function of a tutor for those younger or less skilled. The college might also assist the comprehensive high school to broaden the opportunity for intense concentration and specialization that can be so valuable.

7. *Overlapping Curricula.* Educational research has long shown a disturbing degree of overlap in elementary, secondary schools and college work. In 1928 a study by Osburn indicated that there was a 20% overlap between elementary and secondary school and a 10-23% overlap in different subjects taught at the high school and college level. This has apparently grown much worse, however, for a study in 1971 indicated that college instructors estimated that there was a 21% overlap in mathematics, 23% in science, 23% in English, and 24% in social science. High school teachers agreed with the estimates in mathematics and science but felt the overlap in English and social science was 34% and 39% respectively (Blanchard, 1971). Although some repetition may be desirable, the affect of unplanned duplication works a hardship on many students. It needs to be corrected by much closer communication between college and high school instructors in the various disciplines.

8. *Quest for Students.* A less educational but no less real force affecting school-college relations is the current and projected decrease in the number of students in the traditional college-bound age group because of lower birth rates. There are regional variations in this decrease, but the pattern is clear, and it will have a substantial impact on education. Postsecondary institutions have begun seeking new clients such as adult learners and other groups who have formerly been excluded from higher education. Many colleges are also re-examining their relationships with the high school to see if they can meet the needs of some students who have not yet graduated from secondary school, become better known in the high school, and be in a more competitive position to attract students after high school graduation.

The competition for students could become a negative factor in school-college relations if either level seeks to take or withhold students from the other without primary regard for the students' interests.

9. *Teaching.* There is widespread interest at the secondary and collegiate level in improving the effectiveness of instruction. One form of this concern at the elementary and secondary level is the concept of competence based certification and in-service training. In the collegiate sector, the emphasis has been upon increased attention to the preparation of teachers in doctoral programs, to faculty evaluation and to staff development activities. There is also interest at each level in developing more effective teaching materials, making greater use of technology, and of broadening the instructional repertoire. These developments suggest the need for increased contact and informational exchange between teachers in both sectors as they experiment and seek more effective means of facilitating student learning.

10. *Fiscal Pressures.* Another force affecting school-college relations is the increasing cost of education and the resistance of taxpayers and individual students to bear these costs. These attitudes, coupled with a consumer movement characterized by expectations of greater accountability, may make the society increasingly dissatisfied with an ineffective, overlapping, and non-cooperative educational system.

In the past, public schools have been supported by local taxes and state assistance while public colleges have looked to student tuition, gifts, and state aid. There is a growing tendency, however, to see the financing of education as a single budgetary package and to press for more rational coordination. Some educational leaders see the need to establish state "super-boards," similar to those that exist in New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island, to oversee all levels of educational activity and avoid destructive competition for funds while encouraging educational cooperation (Pierce, 1973, p. 1).

These forces for change require a response from the educational community which will overcome the communication gap and create more effective interaction between schools and colleges. A variety of formal and informal activities designed to create a better learning continuum for students need to be undertaken. Fortunately, it is not necessary to merely speculate as to what could or should be done. There are a number of schools and colleges already engaged in efforts to make a better mesh of things. The following examples will give some idea of the range of possibilities.

Many colleges are seeking to provide more flexible progression opportunities through early admissions programs which admit secondary school stu-

dents to college at the end of their junior years. Bridge programs that permit students to take courses in both the high school and college which count toward the high school diploma as well as college credits are being offered. The use of proficiency exams to determine the appropriateness of college credit for entering college students has also expanded. A promising new trend is the growing number of college credit courses that are being offered in high schools under the sponsorship of a specific college, and, in most cases, taught by approved high school faculty. Secondary school students find this transcript credit from an accredited college more negotiable than the traditional Advanced Placement courses when they matriculate in a college.

There are also a number of activities involving faculty which are contributing to better school-college interaction. Colleges are sponsoring curriculum workshops and seminars to bring teachers of specific disciplines together. Faculty exchanges, visits, and observations among and between educational layers are being encouraged. Inservice training and faculty developmental programs are growing, and professional organizations are giving increased attention to articulation issues.

A few collegiate institutions seek to provide greater assistance to secondary school students in the area of college and career planning by offering counseling advice and/or conducting planning seminars in the high school. These efforts assist the overburdened school counselor and provide the student with a more direct insight into faculty expectations and collegiate opportunities.

There are also examples of cooperative endeavors: skill centers which seek to develop better mathematical, writing, reading, and other critical abilities are being operated for students of all ages and grade levels. Jointly sponsored internship programs are being established to place both secondary and collegiate students in educational job situations including teaching and tutoring activities.

An undertaking of somewhat broader scope is the development of local or regional educational resource centers designed to serve as a repository and clearinghouse for educational activities of all types and provide a directory file of resource people. An even more comprehensive approach is the formation of a consortium which includes all educational institutions within a geographical area. The Staten Island Cooperative Continuum of Education, founded in 1973, includes 3 colleges, 16 high schools, 80 pre-secondary schools, and several alternative education agencies. The activities of this organization are diverse and include most of the items already described. The group pools ideas, programs, and facilities in the belief that many educational "problems are mutual ones and that all schools working together rather than separately are better able to confront and challenge educational issues" (Cooperative Continuum, 1975, p. 2).

Somewhat less broad in scope and formal organization, but of importance, are the efforts in urban centers of Boston and New York to benefit from closer school-college cooperation. In Boston, the efforts of Federal Judge W. Arthur Garrity to resolve the problems that have plagued the Boston public schools include the pairing of the area's 17 colleges and universities with secondary schools. In New York City the adoption of an open admissions policy by the City University of New York provided an incentive for closer cooperation between the University and the public school system which had been advocated

by educational leaders in both sectors. Most public colleges in New York City now have one or more cooperative programs with local high schools, particularly in the area of basic skills.

More radical structural modifications are being attempted in a few areas of the United States. The creation of a middle college which usually combines students in the last two years of high school with students in the first two years of college is an example. This grouping does not necessarily eliminate the problems of articulation between educational units, but it does create a more rational age grouping and establishes more desirable points of transition.

Examples of state level efforts to stimulate and improve school/college articulation include the sponsorship of research studies which examine existing practices, the elimination of technical obstacles to cooperation, and sponsorship of statewide conferences on the topic of articulation. The New York State Board of Regents has been particularly active in these areas and has issued a position paper supporting and calling for improved articulation practices to create a more productive interface between schools and colleges.

A more complete review of Mr. Meinert's published work on educational issues may be found on page 84.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blanchard, B. E. "Curriculum Articulation Between the College of Liberal Arts and the Secondary School, A National Survey, 1971."
Description of curriculum overlap between high school and college.

Boyer, E. "Changing Time Requirements." *Learner–Centered Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975, 14-22.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Continuity and Discontinuity.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. "College Policies on 89 Varied Subjects." October 15, 1973, 8.

Coleman, J. *Youth: Transition to Adulthood.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

"The Cooperative Continuum of Education." Mimeographed Report. Staten Island, New York, 1975.

Hoyle, R. "Boston's School Crisis: Can Colleges Help?" *Change,* June 1975, *7* (5), 20-22.

Kenniston, K. "What's Bugging the Students?" *Educational Record.* Spring 1970, *51,* (2), 116-129.

Menacker, J. *From School to College: Articulation and Transfer.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1975.

Pierce, W. "States Need 'Superboards'." *Bulletin.* Denver: Education Commission of the States, October 1973, *6* (6), 1.

INSTITUTIONAL IMPERATIVES AND POSSIBILITIES FOR CHANGE

Elizabeth Coleman

Elizabeth Coleman is presently the Dean of the Undergraduate Division of the New School for Social Research where she also teaches literature and philosophy; she was a principle figure in the formation of the Freshman Year Program at the New School in 1972. In Dr. Coleman's remarks concerning institutional imperatives, she suggests that the most serious constraints to effective change are the limited ways of thinking fostered by the educational establishment. Serious dialogue must occur between those seeking change and those who would support the status quo. Dr. Coleman presents those areas where a clear basis for discussion exists.

The topic of institutional imperatives and possibilities for change involves virtually every aspect of the educational enterprise. A number of complex issues which I will discuss are intended primarily to suggest the dimensions of the subject. Issues which concern the scale and financing of higher education are not mentioned. This is certainly not because they are unimportant. One has to draw the line somewhere, and those two issues rarely elude discussion whatever the context.

Institutional imperatives are those structures, patterns, ways of proceeding, particularly connected with education, that are not ideas, not individuals, not substance, but that nonetheless shape the substance, ideas, and individuals in higher education. They are the setting in which we work—the atmosphere we breathe. They have a more profound and penetrating effect than we often acknowledge; when we are considering change, to underestimate this dimension of higher education is particularly short-sighted.

The educational establishment is a surprisingly recent phenomenon in this country. It was not until the late 1860s that the development of universities began. At that time there were only a handful of Ph.D.'s, no academic departments dividing knowledge into subject matters. Few of the disciplines that now define the social sciences, humanities and natural sciences existed as distinct areas of knowledge. The first public high school did not open until 1821. As of 1895, only 41 percent of college admissions were from public high schools whereas 40 percent were from the college preparatory departments of colleges and universities themselves. Colleges, on the other hand, have existed since the mid 1600s. They were the most stable educational institution. With few exceptions, curriculum in these colleges referred to a body of knowledge—each part was required of every student. A few learned societies throughout the country constituted the extent to which learning and scholarship were institutionalized at all beyond the college level.

In 1868, E.L. Godkin, editor of *The Nation*, noted the fact that all groups in America were organized except "the chaotic mass of persons scattered from Maine to California to whom mental culture is one of the great objects of this mortal life." According to John Higham, the American historian, by the turn of the century, "the chaotic mass had undergone an organizational revolution com-

parable to the trust movement in American business." That "organizational revolution" has resulted in a staggering fragmentation of curriculum and community and a progressive decline of qualitative and substantive grounds for developing and organizing higher education. Qualitative criteria have been replaced by an explosion of bureaucratic, quantitative, and hierarchic modes of dealing institutionally with education. Like some juggernaut, this dynamic has dominated the evolution of formal education in this century. There are sincere attempts to counter it, but they are short-lived or peripheral. Cornell University still needs 700 pages to describe its undergraduate curriculum; not so long ago, it took Yale University one page. The University of Illinois alone offers approximately 200 different degrees, and there are well over 1500 different degrees offered in the country as a whole.

It is safe to say that this is not what Godkin had in mind for the well-being of mental culture. Mental culture has been organized with a vengeance; unfortunately, its organization has been to the detriment of what we would seriously call mental culture.

There are four major phenomena which have played significant roles in this transformation and continue to be important in higher education:

(1) The elective system,
(2) The professionalization of knowledge,
(3) The emergence of departments,
(4) The institutionalizing of the stages of academic accomplishment.

All were initiated on behalf of students to enhance and expand their possibilities. To some extent they accomplished those ends, particularly in the early stage of increased opportunities. They have, however, had more abiding and quite different consequences.

The elective system brought with it a spectacular expansion of subjects taught. Simultaneously, it eliminated any basis for making substantive value judgements between courses of study. The equality of subjects is the principle on which the elective system rests. This is in marked contrast to the model of curriculum it replaced. When curriculum is viewed as a whole—each part required and interrelated —there must be over-all conceptions of the curriculum which provide criteria for addressing change. With the entry of electives, reasons for the selection of courses shift, of necessity, from being intrinsic to being extrinsic to the curriculum itself.

Individual preferences replace overall conceptions of curriculum as the primary justification for inclusion and exclusion. Quantitative measures tend to replace qualitative ones. The "more" becomes equivalent to the "better," since the larger the arena of choice, the fuller the expression of individual preference. There is an apparent expansion of individual freedom in the elective process, but it is freedom as the absence of constraints, rather than freedom as an opportunity to encounter a particular kind of liberating activity. (When this latter order of human freedom is emptied of meaning, one is hard-pressed to know what to make of the meaning of liberal arts.) Similarly, while the elective system makes much of the educational value of responding to individual interests, it reduces the realm of meaningful self-interest to that which currently appeals to one. This definition of self-interest ignores the self that is presently unclear, the self that is yet to emerge, the self that is expressed through the interrelationships of the parts of an education. Finally, the expansion of course

offerings that follows the introduction of the elective system presents new problems of curricular organization. The undermining of substantive and consensual bases for decision-making results in a growing tendency to use bureaucratic solutions to such problems.

Professionalization of knowledge and learning emphasizes the importance of training, rigor, and the centrality of peers in defining the limits and standards of a discipline. It also gravitates towards the recondite—that which is least known in contrast to that which is more widely known. It equates serious scholarship with sharply defined subjects of inquiry geared to a limited audience. When this model of seriousness enters the educational process, those things which divide discipline from discipline and student from teacher become essential. "Professional" has no meaning without the existence of the non-professional, and teaching (when it is viewed as more than an unwelcome distraction) is viewed as the progressive changing in the status of the student from non-professional to professional. The value of students collectively is measured as equivalent to how far along they have moved in this process. Distinctions between education and training collapse. Virtues associated with personal character, private or civic, are irrelevant. Indeed, students become defined in terms of their subjects of study and stages of training. Seeing people as "English majors" or "pre-meds" is a very particular way of seeing human beings.

Until the late nineteenth century, a primary responsibility of college presidents was to teach a course in moral and political philosophy, and it was required of all seniors. The purpose of this course was to integrate the whole of a student's prior education and to articulate the moral and civic responsibilities he or she would confront as an adult, educated citizen. It is difficult to imagine that the professional model emerged within less than a century from this context. The point is not to suggest that college presidents should or should not teach virtue. The point is to remind us of how radical the alterations have been in our models of educational excellence.

There is no more thorough assault on the wholeness of higher education in regard to curriculum, faculty, or students than the triumph of the departmental structure. Institutions of higher learning are best understood as collections of fundamentally autonomous units rather than as a central authority to which they are subordinate. What is less appreciated is how little the definition of departments is connected to any but the most prefunctory treatment of the organization of knowledge.

Departments were administrative responses to the dramatic expansion of subjects taught and of faculty who teach them. They were administrative devices designed to avoid curricular chaos and to shift power from presidents to faculty. When such devices are confused with meaningful divisions of knowledge, the consequences are clear and formidable. Education itself is seen in terms of encountering a collection of subjects organized from easiest to hardest. (The number and character of subject matters in any given case is, of necessity, arbitrary.) Intellectual disciplines and competencies *per se* are incidental. For a subject of study to possess intellectual legitimacy, there must be a corresponding department. The corollary pertains equally; if there is a department, it is legitimate. This rather heavy-handed, arbitrary system of categories has come to be seen as necessary to maintain a commitment to specialized inquiry, as if

intellectual focus, discipline, and scholarship were impossible without departments. These are genuinely astonishing ways of thinking about education and knowledge; it is sobering to think of how widespread their influence is.

Elementary school, high school, college, graduate and postgraduate school represent the institutionalizing of stages of learning. Because time spent in institutions is equated with stages of academic achievement, it is difficult to understand that high schools were created *after* colleges. Only recently have diplomas and degrees become an exclusive measure of competence, making it increasingly difficult to formulate competence in substantive terms. We are in a dimension where the confusions between means and ends, form and substance, are manifest. Without a high school diploma, a person's academic and professional credibility seem to be hanging in the balance, regardless of accomplishment.

While the wisdom of our dependence on this particular institutional constraint is a central concern, it is of a piece with the others mentioned. Together they constitute an awesome aggregate: the undermining of substantive frames of reference; the absence of contexts in which to think about the whole, whether it be the whole student, curriculum, or community; a growing dependence on bureaucratic modes of organization. Goals tend to be discussed in terms of making it to the next round. The language of quantitative measures, of pieces, of interests, of levels, predominates. It is problematic that the prevailing models of teaching, knowledge, learning, and excellence reinforce this process.

The situation outlined was already apparent in 1919, when the National Conference Committee and the American Council on Education finally succeeded in achieving a definition of the American college. In his book on curriculum, Frederick Rudolph recapitulates this definition.

> Their definition described a college as a place that required for admission the completion of a four year secondary course approved by a recognized accrediting agency and correlated to the college course to which the student was admitted; it required for graduation the completion of at least 120 semester hours of credit; it supported a faculty of at least eight heads of departments for a student body of 100 with professors required to have completed at least two years of graduate work, expected to teach no more than 16 hours a week in classes of no more than 30 students; . . . the absence of any connecting preparatory school operated by the college; and a record of achievement in preparing its students for graduate schools.

The persistence of these parameters is remarkable, and it is particularly discouraging that the one criterion which did not prevail was the one which limited class size.

Needless to say, these institutional determinants are only a part of the total picture. Nonetheless, they are a crucial part, especially so when contemplating strategies of change. The history of higher education in this century is strewn with the debris of attempts to achieve more integrated curriculum, to eliminate the lecture, to invigorate college teaching, to achieve the semblance of intellectual community, to revitalize the liberal arts. Such attempts are doomed in large measure because of a failure to adequately grasp institutional realities and a

tendency to act as if we were still in the world of the nineteenth century when institutional influences were profoundly different. At the moment, there are those who would like to improve articulation between the high school and college curriculum. The difficulty with this is that it assumes there is a definable high school or college curriculum, that there are faculty in a position to think about it and effect it, and that there are criteria available for making judgments between possible options. These are dangerous assumptions, because they allow us to overlook a prior agenda.

Effecting change is further inhibited by attributing an authority and legitimacy to existing institutions they do not have. There is nothing sacred about departments and professionalization; they are not rooted in any profound truths about significant knowledge, productive inquiry, or human curiosity.

This institutional matrix shapes the thinking of those seeking change, as well as the thinking of those committed to the status quo. Following Watergate, there was some concern about the education of lawyers. The initial reaction was to introduce an ethics course as an elective. While there were those who expressed skepticism about its effectiveness, no one saw this as an occasion to raise questions about the existing legal curriculum and the extent to which it does or does not incorporate and address values. Values presumably intrinsic to the profession should extend throughout the curriculum. The decision to add ethics courses is piecemeal, *ad hoc*, and avoids fundamentals, not because its proponents necessarily wish it, but because we have lost touch with the ways of thinking that allow for more penetrating interventions. Even in the most popular area of curricular reform—alternatives to the exclusive use of departmental requirements and electives—proposed changes rarely go beyond recommendations to change the proportions. The language of "more" and "less" governs; the supposition is that there should be *more* general, interdisciplinary, or core curriculum. That is quite different from questioning the assumptions which underlie the split between these two ways of approaching curriculum.

Indeed, the terms in which the battle over change is fought are shared by the status quo. On the side of reform are the virtues associated with breadth, synthesis, humanism, enthusiasm, and idealism—obviously substantial values. On the other are marshalled the more somber notes of depth, analysis, science, rigor, sophistication, and realism. These are equally compelling. The former are typically connected with the cause of interdisciplinary or core curriculum, the latter with prevailing departmental structures. This particular dichotomy is detrimental to significant change. It leaves all existing assumptions intact; its terms generate condescension on one side, self-righteousness on the other. Rhetorical wheels spin, but little else happens. Meanwhile, many of the most interesting possibilities for educational innovation fail to emerge, because they involve fundamental integrations of these two positions rather than a choice of one over the other.

If we are to rediscover a meaningful language of the whole and of qualitative purposes, we need to abandon these dichotomies. If teaching, learning, and knowledge are to assume a new vitality, it will happen when we exploit the interrelationships of depth and breadth, of the most fundamental and the most sophisticated, of that which connects one discipline to another and of that which distinguishes them. If change is to be effective, and worthwhile, the two sides must find bases for genuine dialogue. My own experience in an institution

with a relatively unorthodox history suggests that such bases for dialogue do exist.

In short, the most serious constraints are the limited ways of thinking fostered and nourished by the education establishment. If we could affect that thinking, the possibilities for significant innovation are multiple.

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY: OR WHERE IS THE STUDENT IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING?

Nancy R. Goldberger

Dr. Nancy Goldberger is the Director of Student Evaluation at Simon's Rock and a member of the psychology faculty. She has directed the College's longitudinal studies of its early college students and has acted as a consultant nationally on faculty development. Her presentation is the result of work on student development at Simon's Rock under a grant from FIPSE. She discusses the importance for teachers to be aware of and responsive to the developmental needs of students in the area of curriculum planning in particular.

In addressing the topic of educational quality, I would like to attempt an analysis of the waxing and waning over the past few years of what might be called the "developmental perspective" in education. Why do some very serious and influential educators consider the concern for student development to be *the critical* ingredient of responsible education while other equally committed and serious educators resist what is referred to as "the developmental undertow"? As a psychologist involved over the past decade in studying development and education, I am far from unbiased on the subject. Personal development should be the aim of education, and the quality of an education can only be measured by the extent to which it is responsive to the needs of the student as a changing person. Our educational system, particularly in the secondary and postsecondary levels, has become so fractionated, partisan, and rigidified that quality education is almost impossible to achieve. All too often there is neither coherence nor direction to education from the point of view of the student. If American education is to survive as a significant and healthy force in our society, we must soon shift our goal, as Patricia Cross has said, from "education for all" to "education for each."

The developmental perspective places the student in the center of educational planning. The underlying assumption is that, as one develops throughout life, there are changes in how one interprets or "makes meaning of experience" (Perry, 1968); that is, there are continuing transformations in self-concept and world view. As a person's epistemology shifts and changes, so too do personal priorities, behaviors, attitudes, and goals. The task for the developmental educator is to understand these shifting stages of value formation and self-concept in students as she/he interacts with them, whether it be in the classroom, planning courses or assignments, evaluating performance, or advising. Ultimately the concerned educator, according to developmentalists, must ask the questions:

(1) What are the conditions that bring about developmental change?

(2) What forms of readiness, challenge, and local culture are necessary to sustain the process?

(3) What kinds of academic settings best favor not only professional growth but emotional, intellectual, and moral development? (Sanford, 1980)

In spite of a long history of persuasive arguments for a developmental perspective in education put forth in the writing and work of such people as Dewey, Whitehead, Piaget, Sanford, Bruner, Katz, Kohlberg, Perry, Loevinger, and Heath, there remain large numbers of academics who are either unaware of or unpersuaded by this orientation to teaching and learning. An examination of some of the possible causes for this resistance is needed before outlining some of the benefits of this approach.

One of the most common reactions of faculty and administrators to the developmental approach to education, that is, an approach which requires information about and concern for the lives of individual students, is that it is not the proper concern of teachers. For some, too much attention to student lives and problems detracts from the true mission of education which is to communicate a body of knowledge, great ideas, facts of a discipline, and so on to a group of people who don't know. Developmentally oriented educators are often labeled as coddling and unrigorous. It is possible that a large part of the tension that exists between developmentalists and their detractors stems from a misapprehension about who in our culture is to be responsible for the care and fostering of human development. In the past, women, grade school teachers, and the mental health profession were given a large part of the job of caring for others. Recently, however, social commentary, philosophy, and literature have pointed to the lack of human connection and concern in our institutions. It should not be surprising that recent research has shown that "women professors tend to take a more person-oriented, student-centered approach to teaching than do their male counterparts. They are more concerned with the emotional atmosphere in the classroom, with students as total persons, and with involving students extensively in the learning process" (Macke and Richardson, 1980). However, it is this same student-oriented teaching style that is the source of considerable role strain for women professors, because it is in conflict with the stereotype of the university professor as directive, assertive, knowledgeable, and impersonal. Perhaps it is time that we "feminize" our schools and colleges by asserting that we all have a proper responsibility for the care and growth of students.

A second category of complaints against the developmental perspective in education is that it supports an unethical intrusion into the lives of people, because it defines and dictates how development should proceed. Counter-arguments by developmentalists (Lickona, 1976; Kohlberg, 1977; Loevinger, 1976) have emphasized the logical necessity for commitment to an intellectual or moral hierarchy when advocating change in any individual or in any social, educational, or legal system. Anyone who teaches has at least an unstated developmental change model in mind as she/he makes decisions about which texts to use, how to structure the classroom, how to evaluate student work, or how to select assignments. The Socratic method, by leading students to preformed conclusions, communicates that there are correct routes to the truth; the academic lecture model operates on the assumption that the values and cognitive style of the teacher match those of his students; self-directed learning models assume that students have the autonomy and ability to differentiate, select, and synthesize. These unexamined assumptions about how people learn, grow, and change can play a significant role in the failure of some students to derive any benefits from their educational experience. As Douglas Heath's impressive

longitudinal research on Haverford students has shown (1976), the way a person is educated can distort his maturation. The prominent bias in American education toward analytic and deductive thought has led, according to Heath, to an over-intellectualization of our educational institutions. He concludes that a liberal education should strike a balance between analytic logic and the synthetic, intuitive, and inductive forms of judgment. Too great an emphasis on the former trains people to distrust their feelings and to become unfeeling persons. "When we liberally educate, we educate a person: we alter his values, his personal relationships, his concept of himself, as well as his intellect" (Heath, 1976). Developmentalists, such as Heath, do not so much prescribe paths of student growth as describe how education impinges on individual lives.

There are other reasons why educators have not adopted the developmental perspective. We live in an era in which economic priorities outweigh humanistic concerns. There is a decline of individuality in our society and to use Frank Newman's term, an "homogenization" of education. To individualize instruction, to pay attention to individual needs through new curricular or extracurricular programs, requires faculty development, time, and most importantly, money. Few institutions facing the annual operating costs typical of today choose to focus planning efforts in this direction. It is easier to ask students to adapt to institutions than to ask schools or universities to adapt to students. To some extent, students themselves cooperate in maintaining the institutional *status quo* because of their own economic concerns. In a technological society that regards specialized training and competencies, students often seek to develop technical skills and to neglect personal development in other areas.

It should be pointed out that a developmental perspective threatens the current structure of education. If the educational system is based on a conception of student homogeneity within age cohorts and there is a prescribed age-linked educational lockstep from grade school through college, then the system is relatively manageable administratively and economically. In a society as complex as ours, there is an inevitable lack of accommodation to the individual, because we strive to keep movements of people predictable. To become a developmental educator means acknowledging the heterogeneity and unpredictability in student groups, and recognizing diversity in student populations requires diversifications of program options, goals, teaching strategies, and curriculum. This requires a willingness to change ourselves and to help institutions change.

There are compelling reasons for educational reform and restructuring that grow out of the developmental perspective. One central reason is the increasing student diversity. Over the past two decades, we have seen a tremendous influx of new students in higher education—older adults, women, people from a wide range of ethnic and economic backgrounds and now the younger-than-average students. As responsible people, we must try to understand the minds, value systems, and needs of the students we are trying to educate. During the 1970s, educators working with reentry adult learners discovered that developmental literature can be "a basis for understanding many of the more complicated behaviors that one encounters when dealing with adult students" (Stoel, 1980). Innovative educational programming was necessary once educators stopped looking for the simple solution to meeting the needs of the adult student. Some of the results have been outreach campuses, weekend col-

leges, and independent learning with mentors. Our research and application over the past few years at Simon's Rock have demonstrated the importance of understanding the developmental needs of our mid-adolescent students as we plan and revise college programs (Goldberger, 1978, 1979, 1980). Integrated into a faculty development program, an extensive longitudinal assessment of student development has led us to examine how features of the Simon's Rock environment contribute to the growth of individual students. In the process, we have looked at the curriculum, methods of teaching, evaluation procedures, student-faculty relations, admissions, living arrangements, and governance procedures. Elsewhere, research on women and education has stressed the need for educators to better understand women's intellectual, ego, and moral development to counteract the male bias in educational ideologies and curricula (Harvard Educational Review, 1979, 1980; Gilligan, 1979). In some settings, new developmental theory on women is informing a reassessment of coed versus women's schools and colleges, teaching methodologies, and the disciplines themselves. As a last point on the topic of student diversity, Nevitt Sanford has argued (1980) that it is time we stopped believing that sociological theories are good enough for poor people whereas personality theories are reserved for the middle class. He claims that there is a tendency in our culture to deprive the poor of their humanity by classifying them by groups and suggesting that their character and individuality don't really matter.

To involve a group of faculty and administrators in a developmentally-based program such as the one at Simon's Rock can have positive, unanticipated results. In the process of assessing student development in a school or college, inevitably one must turn to the student as the best informant of his or her own assumptions about the nature of truth and knowledge and the value of education. Faculty can learn to temporarily yield their own preconceptions about these matters as they listen to students. In our experience at Simon's Rock, in our interviews with students, we have found that students respond very positively when they are listened to. They feel that they have been given the opportunity to become an active participant in their education in large part because someone is expressing an interest in them as a whole person, not as simply a talent, a problem, or a number.

Similarly, when faculty become acquainted with theories of human development and the student as a developing person, they often begin to focus seriously on issues of teaching strategies, the epistemological base of their disciplines, and the interplay of the intellect and the emotions in human growth. Faculty engaged in learning about student development are in general left with a renewed respect for the integrity and worth of the individual student as well as fresh ideas about how to become a better teacher for a larger number of people.

In conclusion, a discussion of educational restructuring and high school/college articulation provides an ideal opportunity for us to reexamine our own assumptions about the value and function of education. We cannot allow the structural *status quo*, economic pressures, and factionalism to override what should be the focal concern of educators—the students. Concern for the intellectual, emotional, and moral growth of people throughout life must lead us to questions about the relationship between schools and colleges, the content of education, teacher training and evaluation, the relationship between learning

and work, and institutional missions and obligations. Ultimately, it is only by understanding the worth of an education to an individual that we can consider it to be an education of quality.

For a more complete discussion of Simon's Rock and its response to student development see pages 73-78.

TEACHER EDUCATION: WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE CLASSROOM AND THE TRAINING FOR THE CLASSROOM?

Janet E. Lieberman

Janet Lieberman is a professor of psychology at LaGuardia Community College of the City University of New York and founder of the Middle College High School at LaGuardia. As a new educational concept, the Middle College is designed to provide an integrated high school and college program directed to the needs of urban high school youth. In her presentation, Dr. Lieberman discusses the role of the teacher in the "middle college" experiment as an educator/counselor and the importance of a close student-teacher relationship to the development of each student.

Establishing an innovative structure to close the gap between secondary school and college has all the elements of unravelling a mystery. The developer finds hidden obstacles and clues at every turn. Recognizing that the two settings represent distinct cultures is a major step towards understanding. Analyzing the elements of those separated worlds is the second prerequisite for success. A third step is appreciating that changing the structure is a way to deal with the issues. Our experience at Middle College in LaGuardia builds on these ideals and provides some strategies to achieve change. Teacher education and the role of the classroom are two issues from a public education perspective.

Middle College is an alternative high school established jointly by The New York City Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education. The school's 440 students are urban, disadvantaged underachievers with Black and Hispanic groups representing more than half of the population. They come voluntarily from local Queens junior high schools at the end of the ninth grade and enter a combined high school-college program on the LaGuardia College site. Here they share facilities with college students and have the opportunity to take college classes. The program includes 10th, 11th, and 12th grades, but, depending on ability and on motivation, the students progress at their own rate. Middle College has a six year history and some formidable success stories in attendance, with a graduation rate of 85% compared to the city wide rate of 54% and a large proportion of students continuing in higher education.

The contrast in teacher preparation and in faculty attitudes at the secondary and postsecondary level dramatically defines the separate cultures. As far as preparation is concerned, high school teachers usually graduate from schools of education where they take courses in methodology, in materials, and in psychology. They have limited concentration in their major discipline. That subject is frequently their major in college, but their programs usually include practice teaching, supervision, with a clear direction toward education. College faculty on the other hand either have Masters' Degrees or Ph.D.'s in specific disciplines. They are experts in history, biology or literature, but there is no preparation for college teaching; they have no courses in education and little knowledge of evaluation. Many have a love for their subject but not much experience teaching in the classroom or in any method other than lecture. That difference in training combined with the power of the site results in widely

different classroom behavior at the two levels of the system.

College instructors use the graduate school model: teaching as they have been taught as discipline specialists. They offer the learning on a take it or leave it basis. The burden of learning is on the student. The college population is free to come or go, to learn or to fail. The reality is that the student who fails often leaves, but the professor feels no inadequacy. The high school teacher has a captive population compelled to attend, the students remain, whether they pass or not. The teacher accepts full responsibility for having the student learn; there are few options on either side of the desk. If the student doesn't learn, the teacher experiences failure, and the system often condemns both the student and the teacher to repeat the experience. It is no wonder that a feeling of frustration charges the classroom.

The separate cultures even have different terminology, and with issues of titles come issues of status. The academic community has many curious ways of dividing the worlds of the college professor and that of the high school teacher. The values, environments, and resources are distinct. Pay scales do not match; work hours, schedules, responsibilities, all vary greatly. Unions differ, and with that comes variations in licensing, hiring, tenure, and promotions. The public funding at the state and federal levels comes from separate sources, and so credits, requirements, calendars all are incompatible. Achieving congruence between these two settings and subsequent continuity in the educational scheme requires many bureaucratic maneuvers and sustained negotiations.

Despite the differences in teacher preparation and in status, both faculties have one thing in common. Neither has any required preparation in counseling techniques. In fact, as we began to assemble students and teachers, we found that the single most important need for our population, a combined teacher/counselor, did not exist on any personnel roster. Our experience suggested that urban adolescents relate more effectively to a teacher who can also function as a counselor. Since the students' personal and educational problems are so closely meshed and their lives so fragmented, they need one individual and principal mentor who can work with them holistically.

To meet this need, Middle College developed several institutional innovations. First of all, it created the position of teacher/ counselor, insisting that all faculty members have a background in counseling. The job descriptions included functioning as a faculty counselor for a limited number of students in a new institutional unit, called the "House." The teacher with their advisees form the house group, an organizational group modelled after the Dalton School system, which meets during the day to discuss personal and school problems, social issues, and community activities. The result has been closer student-faculty relationships and clearer lines of responsibility. We also borrowed the concept of office hours from the college system, and administrators count counseling time as part of the faculty load. Most high school schedules do not provide time for faculty to confer, and many innovative projects have failed because of lack of planning time. Revised scheduling provided the answer.

By creating a new position, with a new title, Middle College changed the image and the role of the teacher. As a teacher/counselor, the faculty members take initiative in obtaining community or parental support for the student. The administrative structure encourages this. The teachers recognize their roles as academic models; their emphasis shifts to understanding the dynamics of both

behavior and learning. It becomes part of their job. Every faculty member evaluates the students' achievement, and a discussion of that evaluation takes place with the house advisor in a joint conference with the student. Together the students and faculty consider curriculum and career choices. All this became possible when administrators redesigned the work week and replaced anachronistic custodial duties with positive counseling.

Designing a new position was just one strategy to overcome obstacles. In general, the separate worlds of college and high school faculty have resulted in a different sense of status for each group. College teachers usually remain aloof to high school problems or students. They reflect the structural separation, and they enjoy more public respect. High school teachers, suffering from difficult classroom conditions and a derogated self-image sadly reinforced by the system, often resent college personnel suggesting improvement. Failures at both levels are often blamed on each other. Many educational articulation experiments have failed, because the innovators are insensitive to the distance between these separate worlds. Working to create understanding can be mutually beneficial. Placing the high school in the college campus overcomes that status problem and creates a range of opportunities for both faculties. New challenges offset inadequate preparation and restore a sense of professional pride.

Middle College teachers work as adjuncts in the college, a decided attraction with a comparable increase in status. College faculty also teach at the high school giving them greater appreciation for their colleagues' problems. Aside from providing financial advantages, both faculties gain additional stimulation in their professions. Exposure to college students and to college faculty gives high school teachers a sense of what the college expects and provides a continuity for curriculum planning. From the other side, college faculty have an opportunity to see the level of preparation of the students, and they can gauge their own teaching more realistically. The faculties and the students at both levels share common facilities and have opportunities for informal exchange. This interchange has generated economies for the student and the institution. Five year curricula, joint programs in career education, peer counseling and college internships have been developed. Students escape the plague of senioritis, and the programs do not repeat the senior year material in the freshman year of college. Much of this has been accomplished by solving bureaucratic incompatibility. Administrators have devised ratios between high school work weeks and the classroom contact hour system allowing for more teacher exchange. The high school now uses the same class schedule, a quarter system, as the college, and shares the gym, the lounges, the labs, the library and the cafeterias. After six years, the compatibility is virtually complete.

College classrooms and high school classrooms both reflect the expectations of the teachers and the power of the site. The usually large, compulsory high school setting frequently contains many rules and more punishments for infractions. In most urban settings, restriction and frustration has resulted in aggression. In the colleges, however, with the same population, there are fewer incidents of violence.

College students exist in a voluntary setting, they are free to cut some classes and to make choices among an array of options. Middle College founders recognized this major difference in the freedom of the environments as a significant clue in helping the adolescent make a smoother transition from high

school to college. The educational setting was framed to encourage the adolescent to learn to handle freedom, to make his own decisions, and to take responsibility for those decisions. As in college, high school students working with an advisor choose their courses and their career exploration. They are treated as college students, free to leave the building, to go out for lunch, to smoke, to hang out, but they know the realistic consequences if they abuse this freedom.

The assumption of adulthood and respect for personal decisions may be a key to the success of Middle College. From the students' viewpoint, they repeatedly cite freedom as the quality they like best about the school. Discipline problems are rare, and students quickly learn the mores of the institution. Treating the adolescents as adults may also address the drop-out problem as it helps the student consider long term planning. It is a significant factor in encouraging them towards higher education in contrast to the terminal atmosphere of most high schools.

When asked, students frequently complain about the "unreality" of the classroom. At LaGuardia, we have tried to override that isolation with a program of career exploration and education for all students. With that context, students recognize that they have choices and some control over their destinies. Awareness of options and controls are important determinants for minority students. The continuity of the career education becomes a realistic thread which confronts the students' viewpoint of school as unrelated to life.

The power of the site is another clue toward understanding these attitudes. Holding high school classes in a college setting reinforces the concept of freedom. It provides an atmosphere where secondary students subtly modify their behavior to be accepted by the college population. The college environment not only penetrates the insularity of the teenage culture but also encourages the adolescents to take advantage of the prerogatives of adult status. They comingle with college students, and they respond maturely. The peer model of the college student enables them to perceive themselves two years later; they recognize that they too can succeed. The feedback in motivation is obvious. Middle College students sport a college ID; they use the bookstore; they workout in the gym. That participation in college life has a positive impact on the adolescents' image. Their value system changes, and education becomes more appealing.

Creating Middle College accomplished major changes with minor upheavals. By designing a new structure the college was able to overcome many traditional problems and to respond more effectively to students' developmental needs. We believe the core of our model is replicable. Variations of it already exist in Baltimore and in other urban areas. Every attempt at a repeat performance will require tailoring to specific needs, but in general, articulation efforts can offer a positive and productive educational experience for everyone: the students, the administrators and the faculty.

A more complete description of Middle College can be found on pages 63-66.

CURRENT STATUS OF YOUTH POLICY IN EDUCATION AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

Michael Timpane

Michael Timpane is the current Director of the National Institute of Education. Formerly with the Rand Corporation, he was the principle investigator of Youth Policy in Transition. Dr. Timpane suggests that educators seeking funds to support innovative programs cannot expect federal initiatives, but rather must turn to the state and corporate sectors for major funding. He also notes that the real imperative for the educational community is to join together to develop a comprehensive youth policy which addresses those changes in Washington's education policy which he outlines in his presentation.

I am sorry to have been introduced as an optimist, because, by my standards at least, what I have to say might not sound very optimistic. My remarks primarily have to do with educational initiatives at the federal level. This is not where the dynamism and leadership in education will be located during the next few years. Before going through some relatively dreary predictions concerning the government's participation, let me stipulate that I am nevertheless optimistic that innovations in education will survive the absence of federal initiative as they have survived its presence.

I want to acknowledge and thank Simon's Rock for being the successful pacesetter that it has been before the demographic handwriting appeared on all of our walls. To have been conceived and begun in 1966 when the rest of the world was still counting on ever-advancing growth of institutions and not concentrating on the need for alternatives was a real act of prophesy and prediction that the rest of us are now going to have to follow and live out. From the perspective of a nation searching for youth policy, it is certainly time to advance our sense of how to respond to and create or adapt new programs. We have had a decade of reports on this issue of youth and youth policy. For once, you are going to hear a federal official say that we don't need another study of the matter. We know enough about what the underlying issues are, and it is time to proceed with the development and evaluation of more experiments and departures such as those represented here.

Most encouraging is that we now have an authoritative report by The Carnegie Council, "Giving Youth a Better Chance-Options for Education, Work, and Service." This report covers most of the ground that needs to be covered. It reviews the issues that educators have been worried about for ten years and proposes a reasonably comprehensive set of policy recommendations which attempt to address the many aspects of the position of youth in our society. It has been most painful for the federal government to look upon youth as an age group for whom policies are needed which cross the many service areas of society. For any bureaucracy to develop new policies which are both coordinated across and built upon one another is extremely difficult, and yet, I believe the federal government is beginning to attempt just that. I hope that educators will be able to as well but from their own special perspective. From the Presi-

dent's Science Advisory Council Report to many other such reports, we have hopefully learned that in dealing with youth, we each share a sense of the widespread transitions which take place. It seems to be a gradual and individual kind of transition which brings youth in contact with various experimental institutions at a time when the traditional institutions, the family and the school, have much less influence over the young person's activity than before. This may be one of the most critical problems to address. No other institution has taken responsibility for youth, and in many respects we have left segregated youth from other aspects of society. The term "holding back" has been used to characterize a situation in which many youths are denied adult responsibility when they are ready to assume it. As a result, we have alienated most youths. The Carnegie Commission report suggests that

> We leave youth largely to the guidance, companionship, and mercy of their peers in the electronic media. They have not yet been embraced by the welfare employer and the welfare union or by the welfare estate; and they may be one of the few parts of our society where their welfare is left largely to themselves, and we haven't a coordinated, comprehensive way to look after it.

This is a very broad, long-standing and continuing development in our society which we now have come to realize. We have not as yet worked out a broadly based response, but we are applying individual responses to defined and recognizable portions of our youth. I invite everyone concerned with educating youth to examine the effects of their programs in the context of this broader problem.

There may be a worse time to investigate future federal education programs for youth, but one is difficult to imagine. Recent newspaper articles and editorials indicate the importance of education in our society and relate national issues it effects. One story which announced Ted Bell as president-elect Reagan's nominee to the Department of Education discussed what the appropriate role of the federal government would be in education. What is clear is that the government will be an increasingly important context within which educators must work. There are major and familiar questions being raised by the new administration as to what should be done in the federal education program in terms of money and organization. The first serious discussion will have to do with how much should be spent on the federal education program and will it be appropriated by a Department of Education. The issue of financing in education is an issue which will be raised and perhaps disposed of with little substantive discussion of merit. The incoming administration will view its treatment of the education budget as a matter of fiscal discipline not as a matter of programmatic worth. There is a likelihood that the education program budget could be reduced rather quickly and radically for reasons having little to do with education, rather simply because of a broadly-based judgement that the federal budget in general must be effectively reduced. Whether or not this occurs, the federal role in education will be different from recent years.

A concern which will dominate the thinking in Washington will be that of education for productivity or quality. The present economic situation effecting the federal budget will, over the next several years, effect equally educational programs themselves. The question of the contribution of education to national

productivity will become an important consideration. This issue could be dangerous if not disasterous for education, because the quality and effectiveness of education are difficult if not impossible to measure. But if education cannot adequately defend the quality of its programs in terms of a national contribution to productivity, it will be hard-pressed economically and take a long time to recover. This is a future concern that will derive from the overriding national concern with the economic conditions in our society. If productivity does not increase, education may be scapegoated as a principle course.

Another new emphasis already effecting public education is the tendency to push the economic problems in education into the state and local governments and even onto the private sector. Certainly the consolidation of federal programs into those of the states will exist whether or not the federal programs are terminated. Aid to private educational institutions will be more prominent at the federal level through tax credits, but the public institutions will be left to the state for major economic appropriation. This fact is already problematic for many localities in terms of the shift of the dynamics between public and private institutions.

During the last few years, a substantial willingness to look beyond the public sector in terms of federal education programming has been reflected in Washington, and will continue whether or not there is a Department of Education with a budget.

Another Washington publication focussed on the major structural problem in education of declining elementary and secondary enrollments and the effect of this decline upon college and university admissions. Figures such as The College Board recently released, that 83% of college applicants were accepted in 1980, will effect the federal role in education. Declining enrollments in general will tend to release the pressure from the federal government to do much about education. Requests for large expenditures for general student aid or institutional aid will be moderated by declines in enrollment. The Carnegie Commission suggests that this trend will continue until 1995. The facts of enrollment shifts combined with the general pressure to filter responsibility to the state or local level will keep education secondary in federal policy concerns.

Therefore, there exists a real imperative to join together not separately as members of the educational community. We must proceed to develop a comprehensive youth policy which will of necessity address the changes in Washington I have outlined. We must achieve a delicate balance between being competitive and being cooperative; it's a very fragile alliance. Even as we try to find out what is best for our youths, we cannot allow any programs whether experimental or not to fail. We must ultimately improve each aspect of the education enterprise that addresses the problems of youth. As a collective we might effect policy, as individuals we cannot.

The Childrens Defense Fund is an organization which investigates the accomplishments of our programs for minority and disadvantaged citizens. In its annual report, it noted that a generation of federal programs have obviously produced substantial benefits for many of our minority and disadvantaged students, but that in no way have we solved some grievous problems. Black children, for example, are still three times as likely to be labeled mentally retarded, twice as likely to drop out of school before the 12th grade, and three times as likely to be unemployed. The historic concerns of the federal education

effort are with equity and equal opportunity; these must continue, because they remain unfulfilled objectives. There is certainly much more access to education programs for most of our citizens, but we have not achieved the kinds of results from our education programs promised by that access. As considerations of quality arise, there will be a temptation during harsh economic times to allow equity in our federal programs to slowly erode. We need to keep this objective clearly in mind as we attempt to achieve a youth policy of national proportion.

The attention of the federal education community is beginning to turn to youth concerns. Although there historically has been no youth education policy to speak of in Washington, we have seen federal education programs begin to develop a focus on this age group, even the youth initiative measure has some chance of passage this year with more support from educators. We are closer than ever to a meaningful relationship between the Department of Education and the Labor Department in Washington. In youth initiative we could have the education and manpower sectors cooperating importantly at the local level for one of the few times in history. This type of a coordination of efforts is going to be needed if a more comprehensive policy than the youth initiative is to receive the legislative attention it will need to become a reality.

For a list of Dr. Timpane's publications on education see page 86.

EARLY EXIT

Tommy M. Tomlinson

Tommy M. Tomlinson is a Senior Associate in the Office of Special Studies at the National Institute of Education in Washington. In his presentation focused on the "early-exit" option, Dr. Tomlinson examines this option as it is presently administered in the states of Florida and California. Although the "early-exit" option has several formidable problems, in Dr. Tomlinson's opinion the merits of such programs make it a clear need for students at the secondary level in education.[1]

To date just two states, California and Florida, have enacted legislation which overrides the states' compulsory education laws by permitting "early-exit" from high school upon successful passage of a proficiency examination. The objective of the early-exit programs in both states is approximately the same: to provide high school students with an opportunity to leave school prior to their scheduled year of graduation without suffering the loss that accompanies scholastic failure or a missing diploma. Beyond this common goal, the procedures, regulations and effects of the two programs differ substantially, and, when compared, provide excellent examples of a reform which was operationally restrained (Florida) compared to one which was given substantial latitude in its execution.

Faced with the by-now commonplace dilemma of reconciling an ever increasing drop-out rate with laws that required school attendance until age 18 or graduation, California in the early 1970s considered abolishing the compulsory education law itself. The Bill to abolish compulsory school attendance was revised in a way that would increase student choice in the matter of their schooling and added a provision for "early-exit" if the student could demonstrate proficiency in "high school level skills." Passed in 1972, the Bill permitted any child 16 or over to request confirmation of proficiency and, if successful, to leave school with their parent's permission. At this stage the certification of proficiency was not considered equivalent to graduation, but in 1973 equivalency was granted by the State legislature which deemed the certificate equal to the diploma.

The California State Department of Education constructed an examination which tapped the general skills areas taught in the State's high schools. The examination was normed on high school seniors, and a passing grade was set at the average score attained by the senior students. Thus, any student over 16 years of age who could pass an examination at a level characteristic of the average for seniors in California high schools, could choose to leave school immediately. Passage of the examination represents one way to obtain a "certified diploma" in the State.

Arguments against early exit came from teacher's organizations and minority spokespersons. Teachers feared a substantial loss of students which would work against their interests, and minorities worried that their children would take disproportionate advantage of a situation which would detract from their education and/or result in the possession of an inferior certificate of attainment. Political conservatives found appealing the idea that students who would not or

could not profit from school would leave, while other conservatives took the negative position that early exit was just another move toward permissiveness. Liberals found appealing the notion that students would have greater freedom of choice, and others agreed with the teachers and minorities that children should stay in school as long as possible to attain maximum educational and social benefit.

The results of the California program are many and diverse.

(1) About 40,000 young people that are 16 years of age or older are tested annually (about 6% of the 750,000 eligible) and are subject to compulsory education law. Of this group, about 45% pass, i.e., meet or exceed the score of the average California high school senior.

(2) In 1975 more females (55%) than males took the proficiency exam, and, since 1976, more females than males have passed. While males and females are equally proficient in verbal skills, more males than females pass the mathematics section.

(3) The majority of test takers are white, only 1% report themselves black and 2% Hispanic.

(4) The higher the parent's educational and occupational status, the higher the pass rate of the students.

(5) Students living in the suburbs had the highest pass rate; inner city children the lowest.

(6) Eighty percent of those taking the test were enrolled in regular daytime high school.

(7) Almost 50% of those taking the test held paying jobs, and their pass rate was higher than those not working.

(8) Most test takers had a negative attitude toward high school, but less than 15% thought school required much work.

(9) Most took the test in order to gain the *option* to leave school early, and of those who passed, 75% left school before graduation, and more twelfth graders (89%) than eleventh graders (68%) left early.

(10) Twenty to twenty-five percent of those who passed stayed in school until their class graduated and continued to take regular courses for graduation.

(11) Of those who pass, most go to community colleges, but some go to prestige colleges.

An analysis of the impressions and experiences of those connected to the examination program suggests the following conclusions:

(1) A sizeable fraction of the students who take the test are talented but intellectually or socially disaffected from school. Many of those who take the test and pass it stay in school for largely social reasons. Those who are disaffected on both counts leave school immediately, some to take up careers in the arts and music, some to move on to the university and some to enter a vocation.

(2) The proficiency exam suffers from being considered low status, and if the receiving institutions and the schools themselves would grant the certificate of proficiency the same status they give to the regular diploma, more students would elect to take the exam.

(3) The main virtue of the proficiency exam is that it gives children who are capable of graduating but who might otherwise drop out the opportunity to

leave with an acceptable and valid certificate of accomplishment.

(4) The initial concern of the teachers and administrators that the early exit would erode the number of students attending school has largely disappeared. The effect of early departure on a school-by-school basis has been trivial, and the lost revenues have gone unnoticed. In part the negative effect is reduced by permitting those who pass the test to remain in school until their class graduates.

In 1976, the Florida legislature passed an "Education Accountability Act," which specified a "pupil progression plan," mandated a functional literacy program and provided an option for students to complete high school (early) by examination. Unlike California, Florida decided against developing their own examination, and with the consent of the American Council on Education, elected to adapt the GED to the early-exit provision. Because ACE believed that the GED was "too difficult" for anyone under 16, and because the state's compulsory attendance law required schooling until age 16, that year was set as the criterion of eligibility for early-exit. Students who successfully passed the equivalency examination were thereafter exempted from compulsory school attendance. The high school equivalency diploma would have equal status with other high school diplomas within the state, including admission to any institution in the State University System or to any public community college. These provisions duplicate those found in California.

Successful passage of the GED included meeting the following criteria: a standard score of 40 or above on each of the five General Education Development tests and an average standard score of 45 or above on all five tests. Persons not enrolled in school may take the test if they are 18 years or older, or 16 providing they have their parent's or guardian's permission. Upon successful completion of the proficiency examination, the student is considered a high school graduate and is eligible to receive a "district diploma." As a high school graduate, the student must leave high school; they may not continue to attend school at their own discretion.

Teachers and administrators feared a mass exodus from high school, and minorities again feared that the procedure would produce an inferior education for their children. In order to comply with state law but reduce the likelihood of realizing their worst fears, the "career planning conferences" were established as part of the test routine. The conferences take place in the school where the student is enrolled and make up a three step process which takes place prior to and after the examination. Students must receive a pre-test conference which includes (1) reviewing the career and educational plans of the student, (2) reviewing the academic achievement of the student, (3) assessing the student's social maturity, job skills and potential success in career and educational plans, and (4) informing the student and their parent or guardian that successful completion of the examination leads to graduation and that the student will have to leave school immediately. The principal must recommend whether or not the student should take the test, and the recommendation becomes part of the student's record.

The results of this program's initial year suggest that:

(1) About 1% of the eligible students take the examination. Most students who initially apply to take the examination back out following the career plan-

ning pre-test conference.

(2) Of those who take the examination about 75% pass. From September 1977 to December 1980, 10,197 students took the exam and 7,387 passed.

(3) Most of the students who take the exam are 10th and 11th graders.

The impressions from the Florida option are varied:

(1) Many of the test takers have a GPA above 3.5.

(2) Most of the remaining students are "turned off" and have poor grades but manage to pass the examination.

(3) School authorities worry that the standard set by the GED is not high enough and that the test is too easy; in fact, the standard is substantially lower than that of the California test.

In both California and Florida similar interests had similar concerns about the potential negative effect of early-exit proficiency examinations. The law in California finesses these interests, and the results have so far failed to fulfill the original fears of mass exodus and lowered revenues. In Florida the law was structured to take account of the fears, and the net effect has been to reduce the number of applicants. Both states, however, have a variety of ways for students to avoid regular schooling, e.g., the GED in California, the "continuation" high school which permits work-study and other forms of reduced academic requirements for graduation, or in Florida, work-study, part-time college and the like. But each of these alternatives requires attendance until age 18 or graduation, and hence obviates the early-exit consequences or benefits.

In both states there is an implicit belief held by school administrators, teachers and parents, that, given any alternative, the schools could not effectively compete for student time and attention. Their assumption is that students would leave school if they could, and that the only reason they attend is because they are forced to. Thus, school administrators seem to manifest a sense of insecurity over whether or not high school is an interesting and attractive place for many students to be. In many instances this is probably true, but if schools did not suffer economically from the loss of student population, they would be just as happy if the disgruntled students did leave the classroom. But many parents, especially minority parents, would object to this practice on grounds that their children not only need all the classtime they can get, but that early-exit is little more than a legal method to push their children out onto the street.

There remain a sizeable number of students who are unhappy and unproductive in high school and who could probably be better served by early departure when they have mastered the skills that entitle them to it. In addition to those who would move on to higher education given the opportunity, there may be another fraction that, if they were aware of early-exit exams, might work harder to take advantage of an early departure. In any event, the merits of an early-exit option make it a clear need for many students at the secondary level in education.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the officials in the State Departments of Education in Florida or California or the National Institute of Education.

EDUCATIONAL RESTRUCTURING IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Leon Botstein

Leon Botstein became President of Bard College in 1975 and of Simon's Rock in 1979 when Bard assumed responsibility for the early college. His presentation to the conference was intended to review historically the issue of restructuring education. He discusses the need to empower the individual student to control his or her life as a primary goal of the educational process. To this end he insists upon the highest standards of excellence and achievement in educators.

Recent advances in historical research have led us to be cautious about making claims about the past in so far as those claims purport to be objective or factual. They clearly show the prejudice of the observer. This is especially true in the history of educational reform, because the issues are precisely those issues which are with us today. We seek to use history in our own behalf by the way we describe that history.

For example, when we talk about the reform of American higher education, one of the most persistent myths is the nostalgic myth of the past, of a time in which higher education really worked, in which people received a serious education, in which the basics were taught. This idyl was shattered by the radical reforms of the 1960s, and overwhelmed by a disillusionment with the past. One can marshal evidence to the existence of such a prior Eden, but I defy anyone to make a serious case.

Take the example of literacy, in which we see a decline. There is no doubt that there is a decline, but it is not historical in nature. It is perceived in relation to today's needs and the requirements education must meet. There is no lost golden age of literacy, nor was there ever one. The issue now revolves around the question of mass literacy.

It is important to point out that the contextual problems we face now are radically different from those we faced in the 60s. The 1960s were a time of substantial affluence with a notion of an expanding nation, internationally and nationally. These issues are familiar. The context in which educational reform took place was a lessening of the Cold War, and included the early missile gap discussions of the 1960s which took place on the heels of the concern about Sputnik and the race for outer space. These issues seemed to diminish as international cooperation increased and as America made substantial progress. There was also the concern of an expanding population, generational conflicts, tradition and changing values. The conviction was that one could establish new values and create a new society. The name Students for Democratic Society and the various reforms, radical and moderate, all were presumed on the expanding economic and technological capacities.

A very important aspect of those presumptions was the notion that the traditional modes of learning and the traditional substance of learning were perhaps now legitimately called into question. The old notions that learning is cut off from the economic, social, and political character of the world in which that activity takes place were set aside. The current thinking disavowed knowl-

edge for knowledge's sake. People have argued that learning to read and write are essential if one is to become effective in an economic world which requires work. These skills are also critical where individual incentive, the ability to learn technical information for a highly industrialized economy, and the doing of bureaucratic tasks required in modern industry and modern government are expected. (Here the recent death of Marshall McLuhan needs to be noted. His was perhaps an extreme version of a serious attempt to look at literacy, to look at traditional book-learning and essential modes of social, ritual behavior which are based on certain *a priori* values.) This argument posits that the kinds of literacy we have put forth in our schools are really handmaidens of the economic system we have built.

Therefore, in the expanding critique of that economic system, came the expanding critique of learning. Critics argued that the establishment wanted growing numbers of working and middle class people to behave the way the upper class wanted them to behave, and what better way to accomplish that objective than to teach them rules and manners of behavior and call that education, call that culture. The context of reform in the 1960s, therefore, was economically expansive, culturally critical, and politically hopeful about some radical unformed notion of the future.

What we have inherited in the 1980s is the intense failure of that reform effort. Its failure lies not only with the people involved, but in the conception and the attitude of that reform. The failure has to do first with the inability to substitute serious alternatives to the ideas of literacy and to the content of the cultural tradition. Second, the failure is grounded in the ineptitude and bankruptcy of hazy political ideals, many of which could be considered Oedipal from a social/psychological point of view. The older generation was seen as corrupt, but there was no particular answer to that corruption, and therefore, the political vision was empty. Third, people deluded themselves that at a time of substantial difficulty, education was somehow the instrument of change. The works of Christopher Jencks and others have pointed out the extent to which education is a useful tool for social and political reform. That viewpoint has been cast in serious doubt. One of the major issues in that view clearly relates to family structure. The interaction between the workplace, the family, and the school has changed considerably since that time, and school is perhaps no longer the best instrument for political change. Accordingly, political agendas transmuted into the school system are in many ways misplaced. Similarly, considerable historical study over the past 10 years indicates that the myth of school as the major instrument for social mobility may not be true. Consequently, much of the optimism and character of the reform in the 1960s is not sustained in the current economic and political climate.

One of the serious issues of the 1960s was the poor training of teachers which accompanied the cultural critique. The unionization and professionalization of teachers—perfectly legitimate ends in terms of job security and their place in society—brought about an attitude toward the work which ceased to be the attitude of a vocation and became merely that of a job like any other bureaucratic or industrial employment. The failure of society to substantially reward and upgrade the status and character of the teaching profession followed on the heels of the cultural critique to weaken the teacher's identity and role in the educational system. With the expansion of higher education, a large

portion of the major talent that might have gone into secondary teaching went to higher education and soon discovered that there were no jobs. Consequently, the status hierarchy of teachers was never significantly altered.

Finally, the arrogance of higher education was manifested in the 1960s in a critical way. If the secondary schools and the elementary schools failed to increase their quality under the pressure of Sputnik and with the impetus of new funding (especially for science education), the postsecondary institutions were smugly confident of their ability to pick up the pieces. With the massive expansion of access to higher education in the postwar period, and the 1960s, the establishment concurred in the presumption that these new institutions would essentially carry the ball if it was fumbled by the secondary sector. This arrogance gave the postsecondary institutions a much larger claim to national attention and to national resources. They undertook a task with the community colleges, the state systems, and the private systems which they alone could not fulfill. One of the primary reasons for this alliance was the coincident expansion of graduate schools and graduate facilities in many institutions which turned the attention of undergraduate faculty in the 1960s away from the classroom into graduate training. A false and broadly-based professionalization resulted: professionalization of college faculty which cut against the traditional character building and curricular agenda of the liberal arts colleges and the older state institutions with a strong tradition of undergraduate teaching.

One problem we face now is the tremendous boredom on the part of the public regarding education. Yet that boredom is an opportunity. A major concern is economic. How much does it cost to educate? Second, the conservatism of the Reagan administration and whatever new populism has been brought forth has raised for the first time a serious challenge to the liberal separation of church and state. With that, the possibility has arisen that public education is perhaps not an idea that ought to be broadly based. Further, with the rise and popularity of sectarian institutions in the Southwest comes the possibility that there will be an effort to create a two-tiered system which will be supported by the public: one private (some sectarian) and the other public. The hegemony of compulsory schooling through public education may be seriously questioned. The conservatism of the current mood in international policies will also have an impact on education. This is where the change will be forthcoming. For example, we are suddenly concerned about the current and sustained hostilities between East and West, about competing systems. Many of the ideas that were current before Vietnam are coming back. There is revisionist thinking about whether we were right to be in Vietnam; or whether perhaps the issue is that we weren't good enough in what we did. I don't pass judgment on these, I simply point them out because an international crisis can often form the major agenda for national reform if the public becomes concerned that the country is falling behind. At the moment it is guns, but in 8 or 9 years, perhaps before, will people be operating those guns? The issue is not one of a volunteer army or a drafted army. The issue is whether we have individuals sufficiently trained even to fulfill the basic technological and routine functions which require a certain modicum of literacy, which was the original impetus perhaps for mass education in the 19th century. Consider Thomas Gradgrind in Charles Dickens' *Hard Times.* Thomas Gradgrind wanted to educate everybody in Coketown, because he wanted them to be able to function better and to be improved in

their moral sensibilities. He wasn't insightful enough to realize that there was a nice merger of economic affectiveness, moral rectitude, and the capacity to read and write and to be a good citizen. So the vision of the 19th century reformer comes home to roost in the 20th century when we have people who cannot perform the basic functions of industry and national defense. Therefore, the sense of international crisis in America becomes stronger and provides an agenda for General Haig. Eventually, these critical issues will transcend the Pentagon and fall right on the doorstep of academe and challenge the way educators train people. Many of us may not like or share these political agendas, but those of us in the private education sector are familiar with philanthropists who lobby for the teaching of capitalism and with the often narrow views exponsed by school boards and those who vote on bond issues. Whether we have an aggressive foreign policy or a passive one, America faces the major source of its decline as a primary technological, intellectual and political force in the world in the deterioration of its educational system. That deteriorization is non-trivial. It is severe in a way which is no longer merely the classic problem of why Johnny can't read. Now, not only can Johnny not read, but he has a diploma to show that he *can* read, and he's been in school 12 to 15 years. Not only can he not read, but he doesn't admit that he can't read; and his teachers don't admit that he can't read; and his employers don't admit that he can't read; and what he can't read and now produces is the standard of literacy. There is a self-deceptive fraud going on, and we are the heart of that fraud. We are earning our living through that fraud; we perpetrate it, and we find no route out of it. We are in a situation of extreme seriousness.

The standard of what is sufficient education has significantly changed. This is not to say the standard has declined, but it has changed. The ideal of literacy in the 19th century was a very primitive one. It was not based on a vision of people reading Plato. It was based on the need to have a population which could read signs in stores, and simple primer literature. When, eventually, the level of cheap literature which preceeded television was raised, the concern was that literacy had to do more than simply allow people to function economically. Then came the moral preaching aspect of literacy. Finally, there followed the major issue of schooling, one which was manifest in the ideals of the late 19th century and early 20th century, and again in the 1930s, of a very peculiar and wonderfully American vision which sought to raise the standard of literacy sufficiently to make the individual an autonomous citizen. At this point, the plate of education increased from 1 R to 2 R's to 3 R's, and finally to the range of curriculum that we see in the grammar school which includes the civic and cultural teaching that helps to develop fully-fashioned individuals. But as the ideals were raised, the expectations were raised. They attained their peak in the period right after the second World War and have now reversed themselves. They have reversed themselves in an unobvious way. No one has called the bluff. No one has said that the emperor has no clothes.

Many people are concerned about problems in the educational system, but they fail to realize that there's been a divergence between the certification function of the institution and its educating functions. The academy is a major bureaucracy which expanded rapidly because of demographic concerns. Now we fear economic retrenchment, and we therefore become very protective both as administrators and as teachers within organizations and unions. The possi-

bility of change consequently seems evermore unlikely. No one wants to say we're not doing the right thing, because every administrator knows that in change, even curricular change, lurks the possibility of a budget reduction. Educational reform and economic efficiency now seem to be two objectives which are married. And insofar as they are married, they are resisted even more strongly than they were in the 1960s when educational change was concomitant with an expansion of resources.

How do we manage educational change at a time when it means less and not more? One of the major issues that educational reform needs to address is the larger vision of the society towards which we need to work. The national issues are not trivial. The idea of democracy in the American system in education presumes equal access; equal access ought perhaps to presume some modicum of equal outcome. The reason we don't have an overtly pyramided system, as the British and Europeans have, is because we believe that age 11 or 12 is too early to determine a person's career, and we also believe that there is a certain basic level of education to be achieved in high school that every citizen is entitled to have and should have even if it takes 16 years to obtain it.

With the growth of lifelong learning the obligation of education over a lifetime also becomes a right in a democratic society. A central question concerns the level of equal education. An easy and obvious answer is the elitist one. I have been asked, "Aren't there more people going to college than should be?" One answer is yes, there's no doubt that the tested capacities of many individuals are far lower than the expectations. Nothing is more demoralizing to teachers in secondary or higher education than to see serious material which has inspired their own best work chewed into banalities by generations of students. They wait, often in despair, for the one or two students who are cast in the teachers' own self-image who can cause them to say, "Now, there is a student who can really grapple with this question." The sciences have an easier time. Because talent in the sciences is frequently discovered early, there seems to be no widespread obligation to provide any significant general education in the sciences. Therefore, the agenda of the science teacher is the relatively easy teaching of the pre-professional. Scientific language is self-contained, and therefore, the teacher doesn't face the translation problem as severely as a teacher of English or a teacher of history. But it is merely facile to say "Well, there just are not enough people capable of following the highest agenda of education." Considerable psychological evidence coming forward today through research on artificial intelligence and biological research shows that we know very little about this issue. Pseudo-scientific arguments on nurture/nature or genetic endowment are not very useful. When one raises the moral questions of living in a political community, then clearly intellectual questions are no longer germane. Ability is not the issue. The issue is whether those people who perhaps do not have the ability, or, for whatever reason, have not developed the tested ability or the visible ability to follow a high agenda of education, ought not be exposed to it nonetheless, whatever the end level of attainment might be. The elitist argument is neither scientifically nor politically appropriate. There are good reasons for the American premise that reform should have a broad base and a broad potential.

Each individual will work in a specific institution and will perhaps touch a very small sector of the population. But what each individual does, and how he

or she does it, must be thought about and done with a view to the solution of the larger problem for a large percentage of the population. Many in the educational and professional community are defensive and hostile toward the democratization of access. We should remember that even now only slightly more than 50% of the population goes on to college and the attainment of serious learning is still by a very small group of people. Given this democratic posture and the vision of a society where people get a serious education in their youth, what is the benefit of this education to society and to the individuals?

There are two primary benefits. First it allows individuals to assume a position in the workplace which is serious and effective and, from an international point of view, competitive. It gives them the capacity to perform and to innovate in the technological, political, sociological, and social service dimensions of our society. The second benefit is inextricably bound up with the moral and political fiber of the nation. Education produces people who are capable of making sense out of democracy. What is required in the 20th century is a capacity to adjudicate and judge issues which involve more technical matters, more expertise in a particular technical language or science. The level rises with the advancement of science, technology, economic systems, the interdependence of the world, and the necessity for America to understand it. That's the irony: the ante is going up, and the quality is going down. If we fail to meet the required level, we will be forced to consider the extent to which we may be forced to give up that democracy to an aristocracy of economic, technological or political experts. Despite all the diplomas on the wall, the extent to which we recede into passivity is a serious problem. The extent to which in the 1980s we accept and certify inadequate knowledge and experience as a surrogate for education, makes the diagnosis of the problem even more difficult. Mere ignorance is more easily diagnosed than the illusion of education.

What can we do? Let us look at the obligations to reform. If we're not simply going to rail against the currrent system, but ask how we can change it, the task becomes enormous. I think, first of all, the economic constraints are an opportunity. Precisely because we cannot continue to support the system the way it is now, it must be changed. Therefore, let us take leadership in the economic crisis and be a force for constructive and serious change. Let us cease being a lobby. For example the posture of the unions must change very considerably in their own self-interest. Teachers and educators have become involved in the political process not as citizens but as experts. This is a serious problem. We should make clear that education is perhaps not a profession and not a science but a task which we have undertaken as a vocation which is needed by all. It is one in which we have some experience and knowledge but is not one which takes its language or its approach from a computer scientist or a nuclear physicist. A paramount issue has to do with the language we use, the research we do, and the professional self-image we develop. In the specific case of what we do here at Simon's Rock, the question of reform is, in a way, easy. This institution has existed for 15 years. It represents an old idea, not a new one: the early college. It takes students out of high school where adolescents often encounter barriers to becoming inspired. The secondary school, because of its large centralized structure, because of the nature of its teachers or because of the necessity to gear the material to certain levels, often loses the student. The idea that there are students who might do better by accelerating the progress of their

education is an old one. It was a turn-of-the-century idea of Charles Eliot's, and an idea that Robert Hutchins had in the 30s, and one which Elizabeth Hall put into practice. She had the best way of accomplishing a reform. She had a lot of people who cooperated with her, a lot of people who supported her, a lot of people who encouraged her; but she did it herself. It was a charismatic act of reform. She was fortunate enough to have had the funds to do it. She was dependent on no foundation, on no bureaucracy, on no philanthropy. She was not dependent on any multiple triplicate form to the National Institute of Education or to FIPSE. She had to answer to no one. She was an old-style warrior. I like that style. If I could go back to it, I would.

The issue of leadership and the extent to which we become private in our sense of our jobs is important. Very few people are willing to take more than rhetorical risks in what they do. People are forever building careers or building nest eggs for a future that may not exist. The extent to which people are demoralized from taking leadership except when calculated to provide a reward by the standards which already exist (which is really a false reform) is a severe problem. I challenge you to look at superintendents, principals, or college and university presidents, and find real leadership, charismatic or otherwise. It is not only because they are chosen in the wrong way. It has to do with the disinclination of people who would be good to want to take the job, make the effort, accept the pay and suffer the restrictions on possibilities that those jobs contain. The question is one of consensual reform. Consensual reform would take different interest groups in an organization and try to come to some agreement to change. Clearly, consensus is extremely difficult to reach. The idea behind the reform can all too easily be lost in the process of compromise. We live in a society with very high social mobility. It is very improbable that in a community in Boston or New York or Washington, San Francisco or Phoenix, you will find a majority of like-minded people. Perhaps consensus is possible in isolated places where there are shared values despite differing individual stakes in the economic or structural position of an institution. In general, however, the consensus becomes compromise in the absence of any charisma, and what comes out is old wine in old bottles.

The idea of restructuring education holds some hope if we are willing to abandon the ineffective pilot project, and instead, seriously rejuggle the structural pieces. To reorganize, in a structurally significant way, the lines and distribution of authority and power may in fact create the condition which will force people to think about new ways of delivering education. Here is where the economic situation comes in again. Pragmatics and politics may generate a redesign of the fundamental premises of the educational system, without a particular ideological view, simply because it will be more efficient and better. I don't want to put too much hope in this, but it is something that I think is shown by the Simon's Rock experiment. What is important about the Early College is not that it has a particular view of liberal education. It tries to do liberal education as well if not better than other institutions. But its need to do so comes out of the fact that it is dealing with young people with different levels and kinds of preparation. Facing a new reality, often unpredicted, forces an institution into rethinking the methods and content of teaching. I suggest that the experiments with age groups, even experiments with the time of day, experiments with the calendar year, may seem like structural changes of no substan-

tive import; yet, they may be one way of introducing change.

Simon's Rock is an experiment which has worked, but it has worked like many other experiments: as an enclave. Our intention is to do more than that. This leads to my final concerns about the obligation of reform. If this conference has any value, it is that each of us should come away from it more committed to risk what we do and how we do it for the improvement of the enterprise. To create meaningful change, we must be willing to risk in many ways the assets of the institution, to risk our place within the structure of hierarchy, to risk our own image of how our careers will develop. After years of difficulty, Simon's Rock has grown by 30%. We finally seem to have found our way. The easiest thing for us to do now would be to say smugly, "we're a model, we're terrific, we'll break even, we'll put aside a nest egg, we'll build an endowment, we'll build a bell tower," all things that have been done already.

Simon's Rock intends to expand the early college concept in various ways. We don't wish to replicate ourselves, but to try to make the Simon's Rock idea available in different ways—to a nonresidential commuting population, for example. We are looking for ways to extend what we've learned here for the benefit of other people, and with other people. We need to extend it to a broader range of individuals and young people. We want any reform that we undertake in any of our institutions to have that capacity of extension. The Early College concept is elite only in the sense that it can touch only a small number of people. As we attempt to accomplish that extension, we need to link hands in a serious way across the country in unobvious alliances, unhindered by the card we carry or the role we have, or, in the recent case of the unionization of higher education facilities, whether we are managers or not.

To what end do we make this effort? I want to call back a very basic reason for the vocation of what we do. When young people reach physical and personal maturity in the 1980s, it is in a very radically changed and yet unclear social, personal, national and international context. The empowerment of the individual to control his or her life, and therefore all of our lives, is a primary and serious matter. Marginal literacy, false literacy, stupidity, ignorance, dependency on media, incapacity to read and to think are too critical to bemoan by an evening fire as the decline of civilization. They are issues which cut at the very root of our own security; our own personal, economic, and political self-interest. This is not a crusade. It is a matter of vital self-interest. The level that we must achieve for the best of our students and for the worst must be significantly raised. We must be absolutely clear about being able to distinguish between rubbish and serious teaching. We must be able to convince our fellow citizens that the primary issue for educators is delivering quality to a nation that in the next 10 years will have to exercise a major role internationally, will have to confront an awesomely changed technological, medical, and biological reality which will encompass moral questions of a sort we have yet to see. We must educate citizens who will be capable of the answers to those questions and who will not leave them in the hands of experts, who may themselves be products of our own institution.

The strongest card left to educators is their impact on the amount of time that young people spend in school. I, for one, am interested in what happens inside the formal institutions. We need to start with something we know about, can control, and which will likely sustain itself. That starting point is the build-

ings, the bricks, the institutional network which we call schools. The only way to begin is to stop cheating ourselves, the public, and our students by pretending that what we do now is adequate. We must be quite clear and simple about the objectives: a standard of excellence and achievement, asserted by ourselves, and made available to all citizens.

Mr. Botstein has written many articles on this and similar topics covering the main issues in education for the Partisan Review, The New Republic, Harper's Magazine *and* The New Yorker.

PANELS

PANEL: AGENCIES' PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

In a panel discussion among representatives from various agencies concerning their perspectives on educational restructuring, *Lyn Gubser* opened by stating that accreditation of special programs is difficult since agencies are not looking at traditional classrooms, teachers and counselors. *Robert O'Donnell* added that the New England Association of Schools and Colleges' (NEASC) evaluation of any school is based on school and community reports. On the basis of this report, faculty can acquire an idea of their range of abilities, and philosophies of education can be developed providing guidelines for an appropriate education. He speculated that if the NEASC were to see any of the schools mentioned in the conference, it would not attempt in any way to inhibit but would probably applaud, and it would not come forth in any evaluation report as a recommendation for improvement, but rather a commendation. Accrediting associations would be in favor of educational restructuring as developed by many programs represented at the conference.

Part of the definition of accreditation is that an institution has the resources to sustain the level and quality of the programs. Fiscal viability is important, and the point at which the financial factor becomes critical must be determined.

Geoffrey Marshall commented that the national agenda for education is not set by foundations, associations, or accrediting agencies. If the public thought it a critical issue, agencies would not cause locksteps. Under current circumstances this issue is not high on the national agenda; it is a special interest problem with local solutions. Changes take place because of leadership and individual imagination. If several model programs working on a scale compelling to the public existed, the programs would get public and agency support nationwide.

Michael O'Keefe stated that the obstacles to change cannot be minimized since the ideas are threatening. American educational politics could not sustain a dramatically large replication of a Simon's Rock, because funds to the schools are based on the number of students in a classroom. In an earlier panel discussion, Mr. O'Keefe pointed to a need for improved communication and cooperation between the high school and college sectors to help fulfill a dramatic need for a strategy to determine which obstacles—financial, legal, political, legislative, accreditation—are the most important problems and how to bring them to the public's attention. An obstacle can be overcome if there is strong public support.

It must also be determined who will be responsible beyond the initial stages when it is brought to the public's attention. Everyone recognizes a good program, but acceptance rarely goes beyond that, because the school districts are cutting back due to a lack of funding. There has never been a time when either private foundations, with one or two exceptions, or the federal government have ever provided sustaining support for any program.

Nancy Jo Hoffman's statements emphasized the necessity of using existing institutions and making better use of existing resources in starting up new special programs. There is a tendency to look for outside money before studying existing resources. The number of FIPSE grants is decreasing, although more dollars are being given. FIPSE is pushing persons much harder to get commitments out of the institutions they serve; pushing much harder to broker more services from institutions that already exist. *Arnold Shore* stated that institutions must search for cost savings internally since state money for secondary education is difficult to receive.

In regard to federal funds, *Robert Kirkwood* stated that people have gone from a cavalier attitude in the 1960s to a more defensive position recently in requesting support. Fences must be mended to develop a grassroots relationship with various constituencies. Larger organizations, such as AAC, must not be relied upon; we must do what we can in our own environments to acquaint people with the necessity of education, which would result in better support and sympathy.

The results of the educational process must also be studied, not just admissions and initial requirements. Structural problems could be attacked by placing greater emphasis on what actually happens to the students. Better studies and means of analysis must be produced to measure the effect of what we are actually doing to and for the students, and what the students are actually doing to and for themselves. The promises being made in catalogues and publications must be fulfilled. Students and parents should be involved in planning special programs. A broader sense of constituencies should be used to draw together not just those interested in youth and education, but those who are looking at the whole spectrum and want to see an educational system that will serve them at any point in their lives.

EARLY VS. DELAYED ADMISSION TO COLLEGE

In his workshop discussion on the topic of early versus delayed admission to college, *Mr. Richard Zajchowski* described DYNAMY as a twelve year old extensive program much in demand. In this program students pay tuition and apartment rent totaling about $5,000. There is also a living stipend program on a volunteer basis administered by DYNAMY which costs $1,000. DYNAMY is a tuition and private contribution supported program. It begins with a three week outward bound type experience followed by a sequence of internships developed in response to the students' needs. DYNAMY has no academic program or classroom component as such, but rather weekly workshops held on topics of interest relating to the internships. Much time is spent processing student experiences, and an integral part of the program is its advisor system.

The opportunities provided to students by DYNAMY and college deferral

have an emphasis on the social and developmental aspects of education—elements that are problematic in many early admissions programs. In the DYNAMY program, students are moved out of age-segregated peer groups into the age-integrated working world. Students function more independently than schools and colleges can allow. Economically independent of their families, students have the opportunity to experience citizenship and take on adult roles. They have the opportunity to develop a perspective distinct from education, to develop a clearer idea of what specific fields of study they wish to pursue in college. They learn marketable and life skills.

The interruption of the normal course of education—deferral of admissions—should come where it is most appropriate developmentally. Experiential education that is now offered serves some of the purposes offered by DYNAMY. A complete break from school of significant duration for a student could better accomplish some of the student's growth. An equilibrium between intellectual development and personal social/emotional maturation development must be attained.

Early and delayed admissions come together at some point. In the Ford Foundation study of the 1950s, the one common characteristic of students who enrolled in college early was that at some point they interrupted their education and spent a year or two away from structured schooling.

Mr. Zajchowski outlined several strategies for change:

(1) Regionalized resource centers for needs that perhaps one school cannot serve.

(2) Lobbying for a new eight year study of alternative institutions to describe, evaluate, and conduct follow-up studies. There is a great need for such support and recognition of these institutions.

(3) Investigate and support Ted Sizer's study in process of high school education.

(4) Create a legal entity that helps schools with legal problems.

(5) Issue a manifesto which supports the early college/early admissions concept.

(6) The stop-out idea could be expanded by working with corporations that could employ students, alternate quarters of school and working; this would end the argument of productivity and quality. Determine where parents are brought into the process of education. The privacy act has built a fence between parents and school. Secondary school teachers and corporate persons should be brought to campuses for talks and exchange of information.

OBSERVERS' REMARKS

Franklin Patterson

Franklin Patterson teaches political science at the University of Massachusetts, where he is Boyden Professor and Director of the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest. He was also the founding President of Hampshire College. Dr. Patterson served as a conference observer and addressed his remarks to the need for more specific, focused definition of issues. Dr. Patterson also has been a significant member of a committee formulated to continue the work initiated by the conference and to aid in the formation of a resource institute and an agenda for both regional and national conferences.

In his remarks summarizing the conference proceedings, Dr. Franklin Patterson stated that for him the conference was both rich and chaotic, chaotic in the sense that many thoughts, insights and ideas were presented but without form. The discussions were provocative, intellectually stimulating and rewarding, but unfulfilled—still in search of a hard focus. Because the stated focus of the conference was general and ambiguous, many possibilities were explored but have not moved beyond the general.

Dr. Patterson raised unresolved questions and identified underlying issues and themes which emerged. He put his perceptions, not literally summarizing the conference, into five propositions:

(1) The need to find ways to be more effective and responsive to early college readiness does not exist in a vacuum. It is a special subset of a much larger need to be responsive to an increasingly diverse variety of learners. He cited his experience at the University of Massachusetts in Boston, where the largest group of students is re-entering women. Many institutions across the country reflect the fact that there is an increasingly diverse group of learners in the country.

(2) This special sub-set of contemporary educational needs reflects the differential development and widely varying learning requirements of a large and diverse population of adolescents. It is not just a small elite group whose needs are not being adequately served by the prevailing secondary school and college institutional patterns. It is a widespread national problem of trying to use old institutional forms to handle a greatly changed and enlarged student population in a rapidly changing time.

(3) A diagnosis of the shortcomings in the prevailing institutional patterns and an examination of such experimental alternatives as described at the conference leads to the conclusion that restructuring education to be responsive to these kinds of adolescents, particularly the early college readiness matter, is more than a task of revising institutional formats or inventing new institutional forms. However, these things should be included, in addition to changing secondary or college organization or putting new organizations into place. There is more of a need to restructure perceptions and relationships and to improve communication to bridge the gap between high school and college faculty, administrators, the public, government, and families. New arrangements and relationships within the existing apparatus must be established.

(4) This is a critical period in which the greatest perceived truth is that there is no "free lunch" and there will not likely be one in the future. Society is going to face fundamental challenges economically, and internal relations and education may be lucky to be in the second rank of national administration priorities. But this is a potential time of opportunity to improve the quality of education in America, including the need we are studying and our ability to address that need.

(5) There is a way in the present period to find a use for adversity, to assume that economic constraints present us with opportunities for change in which we as citizens, not as professionals, can take charge of the agenda and argue that the powerless nature of the times requires America to affect things in education which lead to the empowerment of the individual through a higher quality of literacy. Strategies should be explored to motivate people, to make new claims on resources for education, to keep educational change alive and responsive to the needs of society as a whole. What could be undertaken in terms of these sub-set needs within existing economic constraints is two-fold. Encouraging and exchanging valuable information about actual models of innovation already undertaken will keep alive the spirit of understanding that new things are happening. Practical mechanisms must be shaped to draw secondary and college faculty into closer communication if advances in educational restructuring are to continue.

Elizabeth B. Hall

Elizabeth B. Hall, formerly Headmistress of Concord Academy, is the founder and President Emeritus of Simon's Rock. Her remarks centered on the need for educators to recognize and respond to changes in today's youth. She was encouraged by the level of concern demonstrated by the conference participants.

In her summary of the conference proceedings, Mrs. Elizabeth Hall, founder of Simon's Rock, stated that in her opinion everyone wants change, but everyone wants someone else to attempt that change first. Her impressions of the conference fell into two categories: encouraging and discouraging. Both encouraging and discouraging in that no one at the conference expressed the thought that modern youths are very different from the youths for which the current system of education was organized, a system that is a failure because of the difference in those youth populations. The students' rate of maturation physically and intellectually is different today, although socially and emotionally they are the same. The physiological aspect is visible: students are taller now and healthier due to advances in medicine and nutrition, control of childhood diseases and proper child care. The intellectual aspect is basically suppositional. Studies have been done on the effect of deprivation on mental and intellectual acuity. Because of the benefits of modern medicine, children today have more of a grasp than children used to have, a grasp not in terms of judgment and wisdom, because those are acquired through living and experience, but a kind of quick intake of

knowledge. This is particularly true in this society where things are instantaneous due to the methodology of the media. As a result, however, with a new freedom, the youth population, whose powers of execution are far in excess of their powers of judgment, have more power to do more harm to themselves.

Children are being educated by a system that is not designed to meet their needs in these times. The implications of this are that the time for a liberal education should be shortened; we should get back to the basics during the time students are in school. As President Botstein suggested, we should modernize literacy. We could proliferate courses if we want to, but not during the preparatory years unless there is a binding interdisciplinary core; and while the academic segment is relatively easy to change, the non-academic is not. The adult role is more important today in relation to the individual student. Quality teaching should distinguish teaching from training; the developmental approach should nurture, not coddle, students.

This failure to recognize the differences in today's youth and the derived implications result in our tinkering with the system, making curriculum and content changes, debating about various grading systems. But this failure is encouraging, because tinkering means we sense that something very big is very wrong. A general need arises which is a basis for a cooperative effort toward change; as long as we are fractured in our belief about what ought to be done, change will be difficult.

It is discouraging that the enemy is educators. We are still combating and agonizing over the hierarchy that exists in American education. People are plagued with ego threats; it is still more prestigious to teach older students. Counseling is treated as an object rather than a nurturing. Counselors tend to affect the entire counseling function with an atmosphere and aura of the clinic when what is needed is an adult role where an adult can be a person with a person.

In the last few years there has also been confusion over privacy and how to treat students. Also discouraging are the legal obstacles, economic fears, and the "trade union mentality." More encouraging, we do realize that the main problem has been missed, so we will keep looking for it. Since it is a common problem, it can be overcome. Most of us, even the legislators and trade union people, have children who are victims. This is a common base for action. The children must be met where they are in our times, times which are susceptible to being controlled and enjoyed, if we know what must be done.

Mrs. Hall has authored numerous articles on education which are available upon request through the Simon's Rock Development Office.

MODEL PROGRAMS

MATTEO RICCI COLLEGE

Matteo Ricci College is a six-year program of liberal studies which begins with the traditional freshman year of secondary school and concludes with the granting of a baccalaureate degree by Seattle University. The first three years of the program, which enrolls 525 students, are conducted on the campus of Seattle Preparatory School. With a current enrollment of 247, the program's second three years are conducted at Seattle University.

Inaugurated in 1975, Matteo Ricci College was created as an experiment in Jesuit education designed to avoid the wasteful duplication between secondary and higher education and to offer an articulate, integrated curriculum focusing on the development of liberal learning skills and knowledge. Development of the new college has received generous support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. In 1979, the Academy of Educational Development selected Matteo Ricci College as one of the twelve most innovative new educational programs in America. The award was accompanied by a $10,000 prize from Atlantic Richfield.

At this time, there are about forty full-time faculty teaching on the Seattle Prep campus. At Seattle University, the thirty-nine part-time MRC faculty are drawn from more than a dozen disciplinary areas in the schools of Arts and Sciences, Science and Engineering, Business, and the Institute of Public Service. Cooperation between faculty of the two campuses now focuses primarily on the program's bridge years (third and fourth) and on the development of a comprehensive liberal learning assessment instrument. The curriculum, designed by the faculty between 1974 and 1978, is being continually revised. It includes, on the Seattle Prep campus, interdisciplinary courses in culture, literature, religion, and language skills development (Collegio), Artistic-Aesthetic Development, Unified Science, and Psycho-Physical study. At Seattle University, MRC students study "composing" in the context of thought, language, and art; multidisciplinary Western Cultural Traditions; Social Ecology; Cultural Interface; a three-quarter sequence on Human Inquiry; and a three-quarter sequence of Sixth Year interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary seminars. In addition, students take a number of elective courses and major in the traditional disciplines and pre-professional areas like business, pre-med, and engineering.

The majority of Matteo Ricci College students are Catholic and reside in the greater Seattle area. Nearly a third of the MRC students at Seattle University live in the dorms. Most receive financial aid and most work, either on or off campus. MRC students take the usual tests at Seattle Prep, including the PSAT and WPCT, and at Seattle University take the ACT COMP test when they enter Fourth Year and then again just before graduation. The great majority of MRC students score well above national norms and do remarkably well in the program, both academically and socially.

In general, we expect development of the program to accelerate in the next few years, as we explore our commitments to social justice education, to global interdependence issues, to technological literacy, and, above all, strategies for better teaching of liberal learning competencies and knowledge.

Submitted by: Edwin Weihe

MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL OF FIORELLO H. LA GUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Forty-six percent of the students who enroll in New York City's public high schools do not graduate. In the inner city schools, this figure increases to 90%, because the dropout rate in the selective high schools and in those serving more affluent communities is far lower than the average. This dilemma exists to varying degrees in every one of the nation's larger and older cities. For example, an article in the New York *Times* dated May 6, 1980 indicated that "over 50% of the children who enter the [Chicago] public high schools each year leave without graduating." To date, there has been very little involvement of community colleges in the dropout problem although it is clearly consistent with the community college mission to assist where unmet educational needs exist.

Society's ills are wrought on its children. Every factor contributing to the poverty cycle has been used as a reason why students can't learn, and therefore do not complete their education. While community colleges, particularly those with open access, have attempted to ameliorate learning difficulties through training for high school equivalency examinations and other forms of remedial education, it is rare to find a community college using its resources to engage students with learning problems while they are still in high school. The Middle College High School of LaGuardia Community College represents one such use of resources.

Middle College is a unique organizational entity. It is jointly administered by LaGuardia Community College and by the Board of Education of the City of New York (responsible for the elementary and high school system). Four hundred and fifty students (150 in each of the 10th, 11th and 12th years) who are considered to be potential school dropouts are served on the College campus and share facilities with the College population. This article will share the experience of the past nine years in designing, implementing and operating Middle College, and will examine the positive and negative aspects of the two schools' relationship. While no programs can be specifically replicated, it is the authors' hope that some of these experiences can help readers decide whether their colleges can be of assistance in dealing with their own local dropout problems.

In 1972, LaGuardia Community College proposed as a new educational concept a "middle college" designed to provide an integrated high school and college program directed to the needs of urban high school youth. The proposed experimental unit was designed to decrease the dropout rate, and to graduate students who were prepared for either postsecondary education or who had the skills to function successfully in the world of work.

Originally, the intention was to operate the high school in a manner similar to campus schools administered by colleges of education. At that time, the plan was to ask the state and city for local aid at the same level which the regular public high schools were funded. This plan met resistance at the Board of Education on the basis of "territoriality" and a perceived concern that if the project were successful, it would prove embarrassing to the Board. While this

may seem a petty reaction, it should be neither unexpected nor uncommon in embattled school systems which are constantly being criticized for not meeting the educational needs of a poverty-ridden society. In addition, the local teacher's union raised objection to the College's operating a high school out of a fear that the project, if successful and therefore replicated, might lead to a significant loss of teaching positions for its members. It may be assumed that any overtures by community colleges to aid in ameliorating the dropout problem will be met with suspicion. Our experience ultimately has shown that initial suspicion and bureaucratic resistance can be overcome. To the credit of the Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers, both groups were able to see, in spite of their concerns, that an experimental association between a high school and a community college, designed to determine if the quality of high school education could be enhanced, was intriguing and worthy of their support.

The administration agreement was that the Board of Education would establish an "Alternative High School" on the campus of the College. In an effort to provide flexible educational approaches to low academic achievers, the Board of Education adopted the concept of the Alternative High School, which often are constructed around unique themes or organizational patterns and usually enroll fewer than 500 students. Administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals were provided in accordance with a per-student funding formula equivalent to that used in staffing the regular high schools. The director, who holds the rank of principal, was selected by agreement between the College and the high school division of the Board of Education. All other personnel were selected within Civil Service guidelines. Up to 25,000 square feet of classroom and office space were provided on campus, which is about 11% of the College's total space. In every other way, the Middle College High School would have the same economic base as every other high school. This was very important to the experiment: if the results were favorable, the school would have to be economically replicable.

In 1973, the project received a planning grant from the Carnegie Corporation and the Fund for Postsecondary Education. In September 1974, the first 10th grade class of 132 students was admitted. By agreement with the Board of Education, those students had to be considered potential dropouts by their referring junior high school guidance counselors, and they had to be deficient at least two years in reading, as measured by standardized tests.

During its six years of existence, the school has grown to its present size of 450 students, and has evolved its own identity. Patterning many of its features on the LaGuardia College model, Middle College has as its central focus the concept of career education, with every student required to complete a full- or part-time cooperative education internship during each of the three years spent at the school. The internships are designed to enhance students' career choices, worker behaviors and understanding of vocational reward structures. Through the coop program, in this year alone, over 100,000 hours of community service employment will result. Upon graduation and transfer into LaGuardia, Middle College students receive credit for one of the three coop internships required for graduation from the College.

Other features of the Middle College include the opportunity for students to take college classes while still high school students, receiving simultaneous

high school and college credit; recognition of all Middle College students as fully participating members of the College community, including all the privileges (use of the library, recreational facilities and skills laboratories, etc.) and the responsibilities (including compliance with the College code of student conduct). Middle College students select their own classes, with help from teacher-counselors, from a catalog of the high school and college courses available to them. They register for their courses in a college-style registration process.

Placing responsibility on the student is an important Middle College concept, manifesting itself throughout the school's programs and services. Given the high-risk nature of the high school students, however, independence and personal responsibility must be tempered with a supportive and understanding environment; the College setting contributes to this also. The College's Student Services Office works closely with the Middle College to develop approaches to meeting the needs of often-troubled students. An example is the development of a peer-counseling program, through which Middle College students are trained by College Student Services personnel in micro-counseling techniques, in preparation for the students' work in various helping roles throughout the Middle College. Health counseling, as well as emergency medical aid, are available from the College's Office of Health Services.

The unusual merging of an urban community college and a high school for potential dropouts has resulted in an attrition rate of 14.5% compared to the city wide average of 46%. Without changing high school admissions criteria or feeder patterns, student daily attendance has been moving in a strongly positive direction for the past three years which is probably the result of program changes that better utilize the potential of the College-High School relationship. Last year, average attendance was 84.5%, significantly better than the New York City average for high schools. Transcending their initial poor skills profile and negative school attitudes, Middle College graduates have been positively affected by the school. Approximately 85% of the graduates go on to college, among whom half choose to continue their education at LaGuardia Community College.

The success of the Middle College can also be measured by the interest that is being paid to the program both locally and nationally. The career education program has been declared by the New York State Department of Education an exemplary model of secondary/postsecondary articulation in occupational education. The internship component has been chosen as a winner in a career education competition sponsored by the Association of Business, Labor, and Education. Visitors from all over the United States, Europe and Asia have been to Middle College to see the school function.

A major problem often confronting the potential high school dropout is the impersonal nature of the large high school. It is easy to get lost. Many teachers suffer from a similar problem: they, too, are often a small part of a large and impersonal operation. One of the major contributions to the success of the Middle College is that it is a small school; the students and faculty know each other and identify with the school's successes. Its size makes it easier to accommodate to individual learning styles.

From a pedogogical view, the smallness is counterbalanced by the Middle College's association with College programs: students can select from a great

variety of college courses, which makes the curricula more varied, flexible and interesting.

Because of its location on the College campus, the high school has available to its staff and students all the benefits of a modern physical facility and the support services it contains. The library, which receives heavy use as a teaching, research, and professional support site, is staffed by eight full-time librarians, led by a Chief Librarian most eager to provide service to Middle College students and teachers. Laboratory facilities in science, computer technology, typing and office machines, basic skills, photography, art and music are also used by the Middle College, as is the College's theatre.

As part of the College's curricula, transitional or bridge courses are taught for high school credit to Middle College students by College faculty, so that students can become accustomed to college-style instruction. These courses can then be followed by actual college courses. For students who in junior high school never considered high school graduation a realistic possibility to be exposed to experiences of this kind is a rare opportunity. The increased sense of self-worth and prestige that accrues to Middle College students just from being members of the College community is enhanced significantly when coupled with successful involvement in college-level academic experiences.

Middle College staff are challenged by their students and feel committed to the goals of the school. The lethargy and feeling of helplessness often found in the faculty of large urban high schools does not exist.

Thus, for all parties, the LaGuardia Middle College High School is an investment that has reaped substantial dividends. Its replicability extends beyond the specific case to the general premise that difficult educational problems may well be solved by aggressive, creative, non-traditional solutions.

Submitted by: Arthur Greenberg

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

The Freshman Year Program began in 1972 as a response to the educational challenges and potentials of the first year of college and to the high intellectual expectations on the part of students concerning the freshman year. It was initially a one year program exclusively designed for those talented early entrants ready to begin college prior to completion of high school. Students who successfully complete the Freshman Year Program transferred as sophomores to other colleges and universities. With the development of the Seminar College in 1976 it is now possible to complete an undergraduate liberal arts education at The New School. The concept of the Freshman Year Program remains intact, nonetheless. A number of students still come just for this specially designed freshman year curriculum with the intent of transferring to other institutions as sophomores. Extensive advising and assistance concerning transfer remains available for such students.

The Freshman Year Program was opened to the early entrant to provide another option for those high school juniors ready to begin college for whom the senior year promises something less than a powerful educational challenge.

In the Freshman Year curriculum students engage immediately in an intensive exploration of what it is to encounter the universe of disciplined inquiry, of intellectual discovery, of difficult and demanding texts; there are no large lectures, no general surveys. Classes are not designed to "prepare" students for the rigors of serious intellectual endeavor—instead freshmen actively participate in highly focused seminars with a good deal of serious reading, thinking, writing and listening demanded of them.

Since 1972 approximately 500 early entrants have come to The New School. This year roughly 3/4 of the freshman class are early entrants. There are a total of 50 students in the Freshman Year Program.

Funding for the Freshman Year Program is predominantly from student tuition. The Freshman Year Program is part of the Undergraduate Division at The New School which in turn is part of The New School for Social Research—a large university located in New York City. This means that the Freshman Year Program is a small and intensive liberal arts experience located within the context of a major university and supplemented by a wide diversity of academic resources. Students in the Freshman Year Program take full advantage of the curricular and extracurricular resources of The New School for Social Research.

Submitted by: Elizabeth Coleman

THE NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

The North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics was established by an act of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina on June 16, 1978 following the recommendation of a Governor's Planning Committee established by Governor James B. Hunt, Jr.

The purpose of the School is to provide superior educational opportunities in a residential setting for gifted students in the 11th or 12th grade levels who have particular aptitudes and interest in science and mathematics. These students are required to meet the rigorous demands of a core faculty augmented by visiting scientists, mathematicians and distinguished leaders in various other fields.

A further purpose is to provide training programs for teaching of science and mathematics in North Carolina.

A generous gift from the citizens of Durham County has provided a home for the School in Durham on a 27-acre site with 15 buildings which comprise the former Watts Hospital, and which is being adapted to the instructional and residential needs of the School. With efficient energy management a major objective, renovation and construction is an ongoing process to keep up with a growing enrollment.

Challenging educational experiences in science, mathematics, the humanities, the arts and language are combined with personal and social development under carefully selected teachers and advisors. Laboratories, classrooms, libraries, and teachers are available to students many hours beyond the usual school

day, making possible extended periods of concentration within a flexible schedule and curriculum.

A variety of required and elective courses are offered in the following: mathematics; two levels each of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics; four foreign languages (French, Spanish, German, Latin); Social Sciences; English, with an emphasis on writing; Art, Music, and Physical Activities.

All students provide five hours of work on campus and three hours of community service. A full program of sports, clubs, publications, and social activities is provided.

Students attend the School without cost except for their personal expenses. Funds are provided by the State of North Carolina as well as by foundations and corporations.

Submitted by: Charles Eilber

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY'S PROJECT ADVANCE: COLLEGE COURSES IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

Project Advance grew out of the recognition by high school and college faculty of two situations: 1) a duplication of curriculum between the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, and 2) "senioritis," or senior-year boredom among capable high school students who have completed most of their graduation requirements by the end of their junior year.

In 1972, concerns like these led a group of high school administrators in the Syracuse area to contact Dr. John Prucha, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at Syracuse University. The problem was turned over to Dr. Robert Diamond, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Instructional Development and Director of the Center for Instructional Development. After considering most of the alternatives that have usually been employed in school-college programs, i.e., 1) "split-day" programs, in which students divide their time between high school and campus, 2) college courses taught within the school by college faculty, 3) early graduation, and 4) the Advanced Placement Examination Program, it was decided to explore ways in which carefully designed and controlled courses could be taught for credit within the high school by high school teachers as part of the school's regular academic program.

As the idea of Project Advance developed, the rationale for the program was extended and refined. It included the general rationale described earlier: 1) reduce curriculum duplication, and 2) increase the challenges to high school seniors. But, in practice, the project has come to serve perhaps an even more important purpose. It is clearly a proving ground for college-bound seniors, a unique opportunity for them not only to gauge their ability to do college-level work, but also to sharpen their academic and management skills in preparation for college itself. In addition, it has provided college professors and seasoned high school faculty with a continual forum for instructional development in several extremely important content areas.

As it has now developed, Project Advance is a cooperative program between

Syracuse University and participating high schools. It allows high school seniors to take regular college courses in their own school and at a relatively low cost. The courses are taught by carefully selected high school faculty who attend special Syracuse University workshops and seminars, are trained by regular Syracuse University faculty members, and who are subsequently designated, if qualified, as adjunct instructors of Syracuse University. Under the supervision of Syracuse faculty, these adjunct instructors may then teach the course as part of their regular teaching load.

The courses are carefully monitored by Syracuse faculty and Project Advance administrative staff in cooperation with the high school teachers to ensure that the standards maintained in the Project courses offered in the high schools are identical to those for the same courses taught by the University faculty. With few exceptions, high school faculty have graduate degrees in the subject area plus a minimum of five years' teaching experience specifically in the area of the subject to be taught.

Students who successfully complete their Project Advance course work are entitled to a regular Syracuse University transcript. The credit earned by the student can be transferred to most colleges and universities around the country. Currently, 344 of 361 colleges and universities approached by Project Advance graduates in the past five years have accepted the transfer of Project Advance course work for degree credit and/or exemption from similar courses. Numerous studies over the years comparing the academic performance of students enrolled in the Project with that of Syracuse University students taking the same courses on campus indicate that Project Advance students have performed at least as well as, and, in some instances, better than, their on-campus counterparts. In fact, studies suggest that SUPA students who went on to college 1) had an exceptionally low rate of attrition, 2) achieved exceptionally high grades, 3) for the most part did not seek time-shortened degrees despite having acquired college credits in high school, 4) rated very favorably their experience with SUPA as preparation for more advanced courses, and 5) recommended overwhelmingly that high school students enroll in SUPA, given the opportunity.

Project Advance currently is the largest program in the United States offering in the high schools regular college courses for credit, taught by high school faculty. The growth of the program has been dramatic. Initially implemented in 1973 in six pilot schools in the Syracuse area, Project Advance now serves 76 high schools and approximately 4,000 students throughout New York, and in Massachusetts, Michigan and New Jersey.

The Project currently offers introductory college courses in biology, calculus, chemistry, English, psychology, religion and sociology. The courses are indentical to those offered to Syracuse University students. Detailed student and teacher manuals, testing and evaluation instruments, minicourse outlines, and record-keeping instruments have been developed for these courses and undergo continuous evaluation and revision.

Students who have successfully completed the secondary school curriculum through the eleventh grade are eligible to participate in the program. Within certain limits mandated by state law and University requirements, the selection of students interested in Project Advance is left to the discretion of the high school, its teachers, and guidance staff. It has been the experience of the program, however, that the high school student with a solid B average or better and

the motivation to work hard, can manage—even excel—in a Project Advance course. A SUPA course makes considerable demands on students' ability to conceptualize, understand hidden meanings, and draw conclusions from their reading and research. This is necessary for students to realize when they register for the course, for parents to understand when their sons and daughters experience more stringent grading standards than they may be used to, and for colleges and universities to appreciate when considering credit earned in the program.

Asked how he felt about Project Advance now that he was graduating from college, one former student had this to say:

> Project Advance was the most worthwhile experience I had in my senior year in high school. The teachers were tough, but dedicated. They taught me more about writing in one year than the eleven years prior, or the three years hence.

The feeling expressed by this student is a clear and generalizable sentiment of the Program's viability and success. There is every indication that Project Advance will continue to expand and improve in the years to come.

Submitted by: Joe Mercurio

SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION: THE FIRST YEAR

In 1978, a group of Ohio schools—Hawken, Hathaway Brown, Laurel, Maumee Valley Country Day, University School, and Western Reserve Academy—developed a program with Kenyon College where able students in these schools could take courses and receive Kenyon College credit. This was in response to a sense that able juniors and seniors in independent schools needed both a new academic challenge and a chance to start the transition into college well before completing secondary school. The courses were taught by faculty members of the secondary schools; upon successful completion, the students received credit, transferable on a Kenyon transcript if the student chose to matriculate, after his secondary school graduation, at another college.

As thus far described, the program does not differ from other high school/college plans. However, structured with care and generous assistance from the Martha Holden Jennings and George Gund Foundations, this program includes several distinctive characteristics. First, instead of simply providing credits, the highest priority was placed on providing an experience that helped the student's transition from school to college. The primacy of this goal is suggested by the program's name: School-College Articulation Project (SCAP, for short). Another major consideration was the enrichment of both college and secondary school teachers involved in the program through frequent and sustained contact. Furthermore, the planning committee built a number of requirements into the program to ensure that credit accumulation was not the students' primary goal. Students had to be accepted both by Kenyon's admissions office and by a

representative from the department in which the desired course was taught. Also, each student was permitted to take no more than two Kenyon courses, because they were planned as more demanding than high school honors or advanced placement classes. Finally, all SCAP students were required to spend a day on the Kenyon campus, both attending classes and taking part in a demonstration class taught by the college's departmental representative.

Faculty from the schools, interviewed and formally appointed by the college, not only devised course syllabi with their Kenyon counterparts but also discussed each text in detail with the Kenyon course representative. In addition, the Kenyon course representative visited each of the schools at least once during the year to evaluate the teacher's use of the text and the students' responses, helped plan essay topics and exams, set up crossgrading exercises using essays or exams from all the schools as well as from Kenyon.

The planning and experimenting stage is complete. During the 1979-80 school year, one or more of the six independent schools taught Kenyon's courses in freshman English, statistics, philosophy, and modern European history. In each case, the Kenyon representative and the secondary school teachers judged the program and the individual courses to be successful.

As a teacher in one of the independent school sections of Kenyon's freshman English course, I can illustrate the program's achievements best through an account of the course I taught. For a week in June, 1979, appointed teachers from Hathaway Brown, Maumee Valley Country Day, University School, and Western Reserve Academy met with a number of Kenyon's English faculty to discuss the curriculum and goals of Kenyon's English 1-2: Literature and Language, a course described in the catalogue as a

> close study of the major literary kinds, or genres, by means of distinguished examples both native and translated. Frequent papers, mainly concerned with the literary works discussed, are required and thoroughly analyzed in class and in conference.

In addition to subscribing to the principles of close reading and careful writing, we agreed on a list of texts which we all would teach, a list that would occupy much of the year but would not preclude other works that individual teachers might choose to add. The decisions about texts and goals were made easily. How to develop common standards and approaches without inhibiting individual teachers was more complex. To establish writing criteria, we decided to meet twice during the year for exercises in grading identical papers. We found that the school and college standards were remarkably consistent.

We confronted the matter of approaches to the texts by having different members of the group conduct a seminar about one of the works common to the course. In discussion, other members of the group would add to or modify the approach reflected in the presentation. In each case, the initial presentation was found suitable to everyone, although some were subjected to extensive revision. The majority of the initial presentations came from Dr. Gerrit Roelofs, who helped the secondary school teachers understand the level of expectation Kenyon teachers have in freshman classes. This was a particularly profitable experience for the secondary school teachers.

Once implemented, students in the program worked harder and developed more rapidly than their counterparts who were not involved in the SCAP courses.

Although the first year of SCAP courses has been judged a success by everyone involved, a number of issues at every level of the program remain to be resolved. First, according to the students' comments, the visits to the Kenyon campus need to be restructured. Wisely, Kenyon and its admissions office avoided making visits by the schools occasions for recruiting. However, students, most of whom visited during the fall, still construed their days at Kenyon as inducements to apply to the college. Faculty at Kenyon and the schools are inclined to believe that the students, all of whom were in the process of applying to college, saw their visits as admissions-sponsored, because they were encouraged to explore the campus and sample classes as well as attend specified classes in the course in which they were enrolled. Although any other possible approach will narrow a student's exposure to Kenyon, we plan to focus future visits on the subject area in which the student is taking a course by requiring attendance in classes related to the SCAP course and by urging attention to the similarities and differences between their course and equivalent ones taught within the college.

Other student criticisms concerned the ways in which a class in the schools differed from its Kenyon counterpart. A number expressed disappointment that many school classes met for five short periods a week instead of imitating Kenyon's three one hour meetings. Several of the schools have managed to schedule double periods this year, diminishing the problem.

An anticipated difference between school and college students that did not materialize involves student performance during the spring. Students in the schools are frequently affected by "senior slump." However, we have learned that first year students in college are subject just as often to "freshman fall-off." Although SCAP teachers have found this reassuring, we will try to control the tendency to slack off by making an issue of the three hour examination that concludes all SCAP courses, an exam that is constructed with the help of the Kenyon course representative.

Teachers of the various courses, appointed Associates in Instruction by Kenyon, have found that their duties enrich them as teachers. Contact with members of the regular Kenyon faculty has been extremely stimulating. However, the administrations of the schools, although enthusiastic about the program, have not been inclined to make allowances for the time required to prepare courses that must satisfy requirements outside the school as well as within.

The difficulties recounted are minor; they appear inconsequential next to the program's strengths and successes. We will address them all this year while we confront the larger issues facing the program: increasing the transferability of SCAP credits and extending their use for student placement in college, considering the inclusion of a limited number of other schools in SCAP, making the program known throughout the country, and developing new courses.

In 1980-81, American history, French, physics, and studio art have been added to the SCAP curriculum. Next year we hope to add comparative religion, economics, mythology, Latin, and chemistry. The enrollment for all courses has increased by fifty percent over last year, although we do not know how acceptable the transfer credits will be at other colleges. Comments from students indicate that the popularity of SCAP is based on reports from last year's group that the courses are both challenging and interesting.

Foundation grants will expire at the end of the third year of classes. How-

ever, by charging SCAP students a fee for each course, we expect to have funds thereafter to support the necessary course evaluation and planning meetings and administrative expenses. With standards and procedures established, the costs of the program will diminish; meetings will be necessary only to maintain standards and develop transferability of credit.

The program appears to be profitable for the faculty and students involved. By the end of the three year support period, we expect to have a stable, self-sustaining, academically challenging program that materially improves our students' transition from school to college.

Submitted by: Richard Rickard

SIMON'S ROCK

In the late 1960s and early 1970s the American educational system came under attack as inadequately providing for the needs of our country's mid-adolescents. Students began to accuse the educational establishment of wasting their time and talents and of underestimating their ability to think about the real world. Increasing dropout rates and a new tendency to avoid college altogether highlighted the seriousness of the students' charges against our secondary and postsecondary school. In the years since the alarm was first sounded, the students' cry for relevance and meaning in their education has had the effect in altering the curriculum in many high schools and colleges. Secondary schools have tried to satisfy their students' need to expand beyond the traditional high school curriculum by introducing collegiate-level courses or by allowing students to gain credits in nearby colleges. Colleges have recognized the need to attend to the development of the "whole person" by paying more attention to out-of-the-classroom growth experiences and to those processes by which the student evolves a system of values and life goals. Curricular innovations notwithstanding, little real attention has been given to the kinds of structural changes in our educational system that might help to deal with the mid-adolescent complaints of boredom, alienation, passivity, and adult condescension. The wisdom of the traditional structure, that is, the educational lockstep of 8 years elementary, 4 years high school, 4 years college, and on into the nether reaches of post-collegiate education, has not been broadly questioned in educational circles in spite of the obvious and increasing popularity among students of early college admissions and advanced placement programs. With few exceptions, colleges and universities pay little attention to the problems of articulation between high school and college. On the contrary, according to a report on early education by the New York Times[1], educators at both the high school and college level are often more concerned about the economic and social implica-

NOTE: Segments of this paper have been drawn from "Meeting the Developmental Needs of the Early College Student: The Simon's Rock Experience," Nancy Goldberger, May 1980.

tions of tampering with the traditional academic structure than they are eager to consider the possible benefits. Challenging the educational status quo and the sanctity of the high school diploma may not be everyone's solution to the problems of American adolescents, but it was the founding philosophy on which Simon's Rock Early College was based.

The recognition that some young people are ready for college level work before reaching the age of eighteen is not a new one. In the United States, from the days of Hutchins' pioneering venture at the University of Chicago to current day proliferation of early admissions programs and such special efforts as the Gifted Students Program at Johns Hopkins, opportunities have existed for a few select students to enter college early. Historically in most Western countries, students have been admitted to the university at a relatively young age compared with their American counterparts whose adolescence is prolonged and who spend the "best" of their teenage years in junior and senior high schools. For most American parents and teachers, the orderly progression through the twelve years of elementary and secondary school is not only the norm for young people but an unquestionably valid prerequisite for entering the realm of conceptual thought and mature self-determination expected of college students. However, developmentalists and educators have noted that young people reach social and intellectual maturity earlier and come to college with more knowledge than did students in the past. Large numbers of students every year regularly take the College Board's Advanced Placement Program in the 11th and 12th grade. According to test scores, these students are as fully prepared for college as secondary school graduates. As stated in the CEEB study *16 to 20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group*[2], "(secondary) schools appear to hold on to their older students far too hard, to fail to recognize the essential difference between the large children in their ninth and tenth grades and the young adults, physically mature and eager to test their wings, in grades 11 and 12." The study indicted our educational system as sustaining the existing structures which are inadequate for the period of growth and transition known as mid-adolescence and recommended the development of middle or early college options for those students who are ready to make the shift. Another important study of higher education, *Less Time, More Options*[3], published by the Carnegie Commission in the early 1970s, also made the point that young people, jobs, and life-styles have changed and, from this premise, propose modifications in the structure of postsecondary education: provide more options and shorten the length of time in formal education. The study claims that there is considerable redundancy in the high school and college curriculum and that the eight years spent moving through this curriculum could be reduced by roughly one-fourth without sacrificing educational quality. The influential 1971 White House Conference on Youth and President's Science Advisory Committee headed by James Coleman underlined the manner in which our society and educational system delays the entry of young people into adulthood. These studies then, along with the contributions of innovative individuals such as Chicago's Hutchins and Elizabeth Hall, the founder of Simon's Rock, represent the seminal thought behind the concept of the early college. Few institutions, however, have attempted to put this concept into practice. One of the reasons has been the reservations of parents and educators about the psychological readiness of the 10th and 11th grader for college life.

One of the most frequently mentioned issues in discussing mid-adolescence is a commonly observed lag of emotional behind intellectual development. Peter Blos in his writing on adolescent development has discussed mid-adolescence as a period when individuals may have developed mature mental processes but not yet organized egos or distinct life plans. The relative smoothness of development across intellectual and emotional spheres was probably an assumption in the first early admissions programs. However, since the University of Chicago days when gifted young early-entry freshmen were brought to the urban campus and attended classes with older students, it was noted that intellectual giftedness and facility in passing exams does not insure psychological maturity or social grace. Retrospective accounts from early college students themselves have indicated a range of adjustment problems—feelings of insecurity and loneliness, awkwardness and self-consciousness, fear of competing on a social level, and sometimes regret having tried too much too soon. Certainly, some of these problems are what an anxious parent might anticipate in trying to decide if his child should begin college early. The attempt to integrate the younger student into the social life on a campus where he is outranked at every turn by the older students may indeed be the crux of the problem with many early admissions programs. Little is known about what contributes to successful adjustment of the younger student at college and too little attention is given anywhere to making the high school to college transition easier, for the 18 year old *or* the 16 year old freshman.

The authors of *16 to 20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group* argue that these ages span a natural peer group, in which individuals can benefit from life in a community separate from their families but ideally in an educational institution which does not over-estimate their commitment to specific fields or life-goals. It is at this period in their lives when young people do not want to be confined to a narrow curriculum and are easily stimulated by a liberal arts program. Mid-adolescence is the period of the emergence of formal reasoning, the ability to think about thought, and the recognition of the relativism of knowledge. It is also the period of movement away from the safety of the parental world and away from conformity to one's cultural milieu—a change which often brings pain and a sense of loss of familiar structures. Release from the constraints of high school curricula and high school mores is what many young people want; middle schools or early colleges which have been especially designed to attend to issues of affective as well as intellectual growth may be what they need.

Simon's Rock Early College was founded in 1964 by Elizabeth B. Hall well before the above mentioned study commissions had made their points in the early 1970s. Mrs. Hall had recognized the need for more educational options for adolescents and strongly believed in the College's responsibility for providing an environment which promotes emotional as well as intellectual growth. In 1979, Simon's Rock became an autonomous unit of Bard College, an older innovative small liberal arts college in New York State. Simon's Rock, located in Western Massachusetts, accepts capable 10th and 11th grade students into a college liberal arts program characterized by small classes, extensive contact with faculty in and out of the classroom, and opportunities for independent work on and off campus. The College offers programs to match the different capabilities and goals of students. Many elect to enter a four-year B.A. major or

work for an A.A. degree in two years before transferring to another institution for a B.A. A few students transfer after only one year at Simon's Rock usually attaining sophomore standing in their new college. The academic focus at Simon's Rock is heavily interdisciplinary although curricular offerings range from the studio arts to traditional pre-medical studies.

A special "Transition Year" program begins with extensive testing to get an academic and psychological profile on entering students. Freshman-level classes are constructed to promote the development of critical thinking and communication skills. A series of seminar discussions focuses on the adjustment problems in coming to college and on the mid-adolescent issues of identity and changing values. Most students live in coed dormitories along with residence directors and student resident assistants. Students have the option of becoming involved in the community governance system made up of faculty/student committees with voting rights for all committee members. An experiential learning program provides off-campus field work in which all students are encouraged to participate. Quality control of the academic programs is aided by the use of external examiners who make periodic visits to the campus and participate in the senior year comprehensive and thesis examinations. The size of the student body has hovered at 200 to 225 for the past five years; students come from disparate parts of the United States although the bulk are from New England.

Simon's Rock admissions seeks students whose intellectual ability and achievement and whose motivation, creativity, and potential would contribute to success in an innovative academic community. Students are assessed not only for their aptitude for college study but for evidence of serious academic interest and good reasons for wishing to enter college early. The Simon's Rock philosophy of early education emphasizes college not just for an elite group of precocious and unusually talented students but for the academically capable, motivated and reasonably mature 16 year old.

For the past eight years, since 1972, Simon's Rock has been engaged in a longitudinal study of incoming students and the factors that underlie successful academic and social adjustment and performance at an early college. The need for a systematic evaluation of student development was obvious as the college sought to legitimize its programs and philosophy in the eyes of parents, educators, and accrediting bodies. What was not so obvious, at first, was the need for an active faculty development program to complement and take advantage of the information derived from the student evaluation studies and from the accrued faculty experience with the students themselves.

Early surveys of faculty (around the time we instituted the pilot B.A. program in 1972-73) showed that the majority of faculty members felt that most of the 16 year old students were academically and intellectually ready for college but many had reservations about the emotional or social readiness of some of the students. The complaints of the faculty fell into three categories: the need for greater structure, the need for more personal contact and feedback, and, to a lesser extent, objectionable student behavior, varyingly described as silly, flippant, dilettantish, or dogmatic. Faculty were often frustrated over how to cope with such a group of unknowns. Two-thirds of the faculty indicated that they had made adjustments in their teaching styles. Some faculty grumbled about how these students were not like the students they were used to and wondered if Simon's Rock was a "real college." Others became discouraged and

began to question their expectations of students. Still others were intrigued by the discrepancy between the students' perceptions of themselves as independent, liberated, and self-motivated and the faculty perceptions of them as needing structure and direction. Few of the faculty felt secure in their understanding of the developmental characteristics and needs of mid-adolescents.

Gradually we turned to developmental theory to help us respond to the questions from the faculty as much as to inform us about the needs of the early college students. Because of the lack of concrete information about what constitutes an optimal collegiate learning environment for the age group, the student/faculty development program at Simon's Rock has been very much a bootstrapping experience. There are now four broad areas of concern to us in our student/faculty development program: 1) a longitudinal assessment of individual student levels of development through interviews and special testing; 2) faculty retraining in applied development theory; 3) curriculum planning and revision with developmental theory in mind; 4) a reexamination of committee and governance structure and extracurricular programs to determine if they are developmentally sound.

Some developmental theorists conceive of development not as a continuous, linear function representing the gradual accruing of adult or mature traits, but as a sequence of qualitatively different stages of periods in one's life. During each stage, traits and behaviors characteristic of the stage come to a peak and then wane or disappear as one moves into the next stage. Many prominent "stage theorists," such as Piaget, Kohlberg, Loevinger, Perry, and Erikson, have written about the kinds of transitions that occur during early childhood and adolescence and the implications these have for education. Ideally, educational planners should consider the fact that students at the same age and grade level may differ significantly in developmental stage and will have differing educational needs as a function of these stage differences. The influence of Jean Piaget, the French psychologist who delineated the stages of growth of logical thought from infancy to adolescence, has been pervasive in American elementary school education. However, it is generally true that most people in higher education, faculty and administrators alike, have not been particularly interested in or informed about the way in which students develop during the college years.

Often in the past, college has been merely a fact-gathering experience for students or a process of passive absorption of professors' prepackaged wisdom. However, many students claim that real learning takes place outside the classroom. This disjunction, the gap between what colleges think they teach and what is actually taking place in the life of the adolescent student, is a point of concern for a growing number of educators today. At Simon's Rock, our assumption is that if faculty can comprehend more clearly how their students think, interpret the world, and give meaning to their lives, then course work and other activities can be designed to meet the students wherever they are in their personal evolution and to engage them more effectively in the educational process.

When a young person makes the decision to leave high school early in order to attend college he undoubtedly is making a decision, whether he is aware of it or not, that may have implications for his future academic and social growth and for the directions his life may take. No one yet knows what the

negative consequences of missing the last years of high school may be. Some parents and students feel that the security and tradition of high school life is too vital an experience to miss and that accelerating one's education is at some undetermined expense; other parents and students feel that any change that reawakens intellectual curiosity and frees the spirit is better than the educational status quo. Early college will be the answer for some people, but it is not, nor should be, the answer for all.

The experience at Simon's Rock has highlighted some of the factors that contribute to successful adjustment at an early college, although, in interpreting the findings from the evaluation study of student development, one must keep in mind that Simon's Rock may be an institutional model for change, but it is only one of many possible versions of early education. Furthermore, the institution itself is in a state of flux and continuing revision as our understanding of the critical educational issues unfolds. For example, the College has recently instituted a three term general education curriculum required of its students. As the institution changes, so does the nature of the student attracted to it.

As long as American colleges and universities aspire to meet the challenge of the liberal arts philosophy, a philosophy calling for the whetting of curiosity and the refinement of discipline in various modes of thought, they subscribe at least implicitly to such a goal. For it has long been understood that the liberal arts should liberate the mind to think critically, creatively, and morally about life's complex issues. Thus, the work in recent years by developmentally trained educators to reform our colleges is not a radical departure from the philosophical bases of American higher education. Indeed, it is a humane call for closer attention to the full range of needs of the individual students our colleges seek to educate.

The ideals and expectations of liberal arts colleges are compatible with the needs of the younger-than-average college student who has left high school early. The viability of the early college concept will not rest on the success or failure of Simon's Rock as an institution. However, with the societal ideals of individual advancement, realization of personal potential, and maximal options for all, there should be a place for early colleges and motivated 16 year olds. The Simon's Rock experience with the developmental needs of the age group has begun to open up discussion among people interested in innovative and sensible education.

Submitted by: Nancy R. Goldberger

REFERENCES

1. "More in high school doing college work," New York Times, 1 June 1975, sec. 1, p. 1.
2. The Four-School Study Committee, *16-20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group.* Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.
3. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond High School.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

BIOGRAPHIES

JOHN BAHNER has had responsibility for all educational programs of The Charles F. Kettering Foundation in Dayton, Ohio since October of 1978. At that time he became Executive Director of /I/D/E/A/, the Foundation's education programs affiliate. Prior to this position with the Foundation, Dr. Bahner was the Director of the Innovative Programs Division of /I/D/E/A/ from 1968 to 1978.

Before receiving his doctoral degree from the University of Chicago, Dr. Bahner was the principal of the Englewood Elementary School in Florida. He received an Ed.M. from Kent State University and taught various high school science courses in the Ohio public system. Before his initial position with the Kettering Foundation, Dr. Bahner was an Assistant Professor at the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University and an Associate Superintendent of Instruction in the Dade County Public School System of Florida.

WILLIAM M. BIRENBAUM became the 16th President of Antioch College in September 1978. Before coming to Antioch, Dr. Birenbaum was President of the City University's community college in Staten Island. He came to New York from the middle west sixteen years ago to be the Dean of the New School for Social Research. He has served as the chief officer of Long Island University's original campus in Brooklyn; was President of the Educational Affiliate of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Development and Services Corporation; and, working closely with Robert F. Kennedy, he designed a new college which was subsequently implemented in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Dr. Birenbaum possesses a Dotor's degree awarded by the Law School and the Graduate Division of the Humanities of the University of Chicago. He has no baccalaureate or master's credentials. He teaches in the fields of American history, political science, and urban sociology. He has been a visiting professor and member of the graduate faculties of New York University School of Education and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. He has twice been a member of the faculty of the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies, and in 1973 Dr. Birenbaum led a mission of 25 students and faculty to the Peoples Republic of China. He serves on the Boards of the Regional Plan Association in New York, the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, the Rochdale Institute, A Better Chance-Boston (ABC), and the Ralph Bunche Institute of the United Nations.

Dr. Birenbaum is the author of several books on higher education and his autobiography, *Something for Everybody is Not Enough: An Educator's Search for His Education*, was published by Random House in 1971.

LEON BOTSTEIN was inaugurated as the fourteenth President of Bard College in Annandale-on-Hudson, New York, in October 1975. He became President of Simon's Rock in February of 1979 when Bard assumed responsibility for the early college.

Mr. Botstein attended school in New York City and graduated from the High School of Music and Art. After receiving a B.A. with special honors in history at the University of Chicago, he was granted a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship and a Danforth Foundation Fellowship for graduate study. He did his

graduate work in social history at, and received an M.A. from, Harvard University. He later completed his oral examinations for the Ph.D. and is now preparing his doctoral thesis in European 19th century social history.

Mr. Botstein was a teaching fellow at Harvard in 1968-69 and a lecturer at Boston University. In September of 1969, Mr. Botstein became a special assistant to the President of the New York City Board of Education under an Urban Fellowship sponsored by the Sloan Foundation. In July 1970 he was named President of Franconia College in New Hampshire.

Mr. Botstein is a Vice President of the J. Roderick MacArthur Foundation; a member of the Board of Directors of Harper's Foundation; a member of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee of the New York Council for the Humanities and the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities of the State of New York; and a consultant to the National Endowment for the Humanities. He is the author of articles which appear frequently in *PARTISAN REVIEW, THE NEW REPUBLIC, HARPER'S* and scholarly journals.

FRED R. BROOKS, JR. is currently Director of Admissions at Vassar College, where he is also a member of the President's Advisory Board. Prior to coming to Vassar, Mr. Brooks served as Director of Admissions and Financial Aid and Assistant Dean of Students at the University of Chicago. He received his B.A. from Hamilton College and his Master of Divinity from Yale.

ELIZABETH COLEMAN is Dean of the Undergraduate Division, the New School for Social Research, where she also teaches literature and philosophy in the Undergraduate Division. Dr. Coleman was responsible for conception and development of the Freshman Year Program (1972), the Seminar College (1976), and the expanding role of undergraduate liberal arts education generally at the New School which was reflected in the creation of an Undergraduate Division (1979). In addition to her responsibilities at the New School, Dr. Coleman served as visiting professor of literature at Stony Brook, and as visiting lecturer at Hebrew University. Her academic credentials include a Ph.D. from Columbia University, an M.A. from Cornell University, and a B.A. from the University of Chicago.

CHARLES R. EILBER is Director of the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics in Durham, North Carolina.

After obtaining a Masters of Science degree from Michigan State University, he served in the public schools of Michigan for ten years as a teacher of science and mathematics and as a secondary school administrator. During that time he spent a year as a Fulbright exchange teacher in Great Britain, and another year on leave under a National Science Foundation Program at Harvard University, from which he has a Master of Education degree.

In 1962 he went to the Interlochen Arts Academy, a residential school for gifted and talented high school students, as Head of the Mathematics Department. He subsequently became Dean for Academic Affairs and then Director, with responsibilities similar to those he now holds at the School of Science and Mathematics.

Before coming to North Carolina, his other experiences included adminis-

tration at the university level and in the public schools of Wisconsin where he directed student support programs.

GEORGE FOWLER is Principal at Central High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma. He is serving this year as Chairman of the School-College Relations Committee of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

ARTHUR GREENBERG is Principal of the Middle College High School located on the campus of La Guardia Community College. He is the author of several articles on alternate education and career education. Mr. Greenberg is a consultant for Westinghouse National Issues Center and a consultant for the Department of Juvenile Justice.

NANCY R. GOLDBERGER is Director of Student Evaluation at Simon's Rock and a member of the psychology faculty. She received her Ph.D. in clinical psychology from New York University, where she remained as a research scientist and member of the graduate faculty in psychology until her move to Simon's Rock in 1973. Her scholarly publications and interests are in personality development, cognitive style, individual response to stress, and women's psychology. She is editorial consultant for publishers of psychological and educational texts. Since joining Simon's Rock, Dr. Goldberger has directed the College's longitudinal studies of its early college students and has acted as a consultant nationally on faculty development and educational programming for student development. She served as director of a FIPSE-funded project (1978-1980) at Simon's Rock on the teaching and learning methods appropriate to the needs of the maturing adolescent. She is currently a project director of a new FIPSE consortium of educators involved in the study of women's development and education. Dr. Goldberger is also Vice President of the Board of Trustees of Berkshire Country Day School in Lenox, Massachusetts.

LYN GUBSER is Director of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Before coming to Washington, D.C. in 1978, he was Dean of the College of Education at Western Illinois University, where he had served since 1975.

From 1970 to 1975, Dr. Gubser was assistant dean of education at the University of Arizona. During his last two years in Tucson, he also served as director of the Arizona Multicultural Education Center. In this latter position, Dr. Gubser directed three federal programs for the preparation of American Indian teachers and two for the development of Mexican-American education personnel. In 1977, Dr. Gubser received, on behalf of Western Illinois University, the Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Program Development from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Dr. Gubser received his Ph.D. at the Univerity of Oregon in 1968, specializing in curriculum development and educational administration. While at Oregon, he taught as an instructor in educational psychology and measurement. Gubser was a classroom teacher of history and social studies from 1962 to 1967 at both high school and community college levels in Oregon, his native state.

FREDERICK T. HALEY is President and General Manager of Brown & Haley, Tacoma, Washington, and is a member of the Board of Advisors of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Mr. Haley received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Dartmouth College and was the recipient of a John Hay Fellowship, Williams College Summer Institute in the Humanities. He also holds honorary doctorates from the University of Puget Sound and Prometheus College.

Mr. Haley is a Director of the Citizens Education Center Northwest; a Trustee of the Pacific Science Center; a Governor of The Evergreen State College Foundation; and a member of the Visiting Committee of the School of Social Work, University of Washington. He holds many other elected positions in civic and educational organizations and was formerly President of the Pierce County School Directors Association and the Washington State Council for Children and Youth.

ELIZABETH B. HALL, the Founder and President Emeritus of Simon's Rock, is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Radcliffe College, where she was awarded her degree in government, magna cum laude. For fourteen years, from 1949 to 1963, she was Headmistress of Concord Academy. In 1963 she began plans to found a new institution that would teach college studies to high school age students, and in 1966 Simon's Rock enrolled its first class. Mrs. Hall served as President until 1972. She is the author of many articles on education and has served as a Trustee of the Cambridge School, the Berkshire School, and Miss Hall's School. She has also been a member of the Executive Committee of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools Independent School Commission, and the National Association of Independent Schools.

LIVINGSTON HALL is Secretary to the Board of Overseers of Simon's Rock and a graduate of the University of Chicago and the Harvard Law School. He practiced law in New York City from 1927 to 1931, for four years with a private firm and for one year as an Assistant United States Attorney.

He returned to the Harvard Law School as a Professor of Criminal Law in 1932 and remained there until his retirement in 1971, serving as Vice Dean of the Law School from 1938 to 1958. During the second World War he served in the Office of Price Administration from 1942-1943 and then went overseas to serve with the U.S. Air Corps in the Southwest Pacific. He returned in 1945 with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Mr. Hall has been active in the American Bar Association for many years and was President of the Massachusetts Bar Association in 1964-1965.

EILEEN T. HANDELMAN is Dean of the College at Simon's Rock of Bard College as well as Chairman of the Science Division. A recognized authority in the field of solid state and semiconductor physics, with three patents and with publications in professional and trade journals, Dr. Handelman has been at Simon's Rock since 1968. She received her B.A. and M.A. from Mount Holyoke College and her Ph.D. in Chemistry from the University of California/Berkeley. She served as a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Copenhagen in Denmark and has received numerous other fellowships including a National Science Foundation Fellowship, a Dow Fellowship, a Skinner Fellowship and a Shell

Fellowship. Before coming to Simon's Rock, Dr. Handelman was with Bell Laboratories for nine years.

NANCY JO HOFFMAN is currently serving as a Program Officer at the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education while on leave as an Associate Professor of Humanities from the College of Public and Community Service at the University of Massachusetts/Boston. Dr. Hoffman spent many years working in the civil rights movement and is one of the founding members of the College of Public and Community Service.

Dr. Hoffman received her Ph.D. in Comparative Literature from the University of California/Berkeley, and her many publications include writings on Renaissance literature, the history of women teachers, women's studies, and community education.

WILLIAM JOSEPHSON is a member of the Board of Overseers of Simon's Rock of Bard College and an attorney with the New York firm of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson.

ROBERT KIRKWOOD is the Executive Director of the Commission of Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. Born in Ireland and educated in New Jersey (Rutgers B.A.), and New York (University of Rochester Ph.D.), Dr. Kirkwood has taught in New York and Maryland where he also served as Dean of Washington College. He has served as a foundation executive, a consultant to institutions and state boards of higher education, and a member of numerous commissions, task forces, and committees.

In 1966 he became Associate Executive Secretary of the MSA Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, in 1970 Executive Secretary. In 1972 he became Executive Director of Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) and worked for merger with National Commission on Accrediting. The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) resulted in 1975. Dr. Kirkwood spent a year with the Danforth Foundation before returning to the MSA in August 1976.

JANET E. LIEBERMAN, a professor of psychology at La Guardia Community College of the City University of New York, is the founder and originator of the Middle College High School at La Guardia. A developmental psychologist of more than twenty years experience in the New York City school, Dr. Lieberman has spoken and written extensively on innovation in education, teacher education, faculty development, and student learning. Currently she is Director of an NEH project on New York City history and is a project member of a FIPSE funded educational consortium on women's education.

GEOFFREY MARSHALL is the Director of the Division of Education Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities. He has been with the Endowment since December 1974 and has served as Assistant Director of the Division of Public Programs and Director of the Office of State Programs. Before joining the Endowment, he spent 10 years at the University of Oklahoma as a member of the English Department and, finally, as Assistant Provost

of the University. He earned his Ph.D. at Rice University, and has a special interest in English Literature at the end of the Seventeenth Century. His writings include an article on The Beatles and a book, *Restoration Serious Drama*.

GENE L. MASON is Vice President for Development and Public Relations at Simon's Rock and Bard College. A graduate of North Texas State College where he received his Bachelors degree, Dr. Mason also attended the University of Kansas where he earned his M.A. and Ph.D. He has taught at the University of Kansas, the University of Kentucky, and Franconia College, and he has served as a consultant to the Kentucky Crime Commission, the United Auto Workers, the Urban League, and the Ford Foundation. His professional specializations are in law and society; American government and politics; public policy; and criminal justice and penology.

WARREN MCGREGOR has been the Principal of the Secondary Schools of the Manhasset Junior-Senior High School since 1962. Prior to receiving a doctorate in Education from Columbia University, he taught mathematics in various high school programs in New York State and served as Guidance Director and Principal of the Massapequa High School. Since 1953, Dr. McGregor has been a member of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and is also presently a member of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the College Entrance Examination Board. He served as Chairman of a Cooperative for School-College Communications and as an advisor to high school staffs in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Michigan as they joined the Syracuse University's Project Advance Program.

JOSEPH MERCURIO received his doctoral degree from Syracuse University. Since 1977 Dr. Mercurio has been a development specialist with Project Advance, Center for Instructional Development at Syracuse University. Prior to this position, he was an Assistant Professor of Education at Syracuse University and a Research Fellow with the Syracuse Research Corporation's Educational Policy Center. While working part-time on his doctoral dissertation, he taught mathematics in the Syracuse City School System. Dr. Mercurio is the author of numerous articles on education.

CHARLES MEINERT has been an Associate in Higher Education with the Division of Academic Program Review, New York State Education Department, for ten years. Previously, Dr. Meinert has been a professor of history at public and private colleges. He is the author of an AAHE monograph on *Time Shortened Degrees* and of articles on experiential learning, consumer protection, and school/college relations. Dr. Meinert is currently examining issues of off-campus instruction and program quality assessment.

ROBERT J. O'DONNELL is the current Director of Evaluation for the Commission on Public Schools with the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. He received a Master's Degree in education and a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study from Boston University. Before his directorship with the New England Association, Mr. O'Donnell taught in various Massachu-

setts high school programs and served as principal of Avon, Canton, Belmont and King Philip High Schools. Mr. O'Donnell has been a lecturer in the education schools of Northeastern University and the State College at Bridgewater. He has served as an officer in several professional organizations for secondary teachers and since 1979 has been the Chairman of the Council of Regional School Accrediting Commission.

MICHAEL O'KEEFE is presently Vice President for Program and Policy Studies of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Work now underway under his direction includes studies of the high school, the governance of postsecondary education at the state level, and the quality of higher education curricula.

Prior to joining the Foundation, Mr. O'Keefe served as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation/Education in the Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In that position he was responsible to the Secretary for policy analysis, legislative development, and evaluation of education programs. This included oversight for the development of legislative proposals for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and a project grant program in the application of modern telecommunications technology to education and other social services. During his time at HEW, he also served as head of the United States delegation to the Education Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris, France.

Before joining HEW, he was Associate Vice President for Academic Development and Director of Policy Analysis and Evaluation at the University of Illinois. Previously he served as director of a policy training program at George Washington University, the Washington Internships in Education (now called the Education Policy Fellows Program).

Other professional activities have included consultation for the Ford Foundation, the Rand Corporation, the National Institute of Education, the Stanford Research Institute, and the OECD. He has been a contributor to the program of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, and has served on the boards of directors of a number of schools and educational organizations.

Mr. O'Keefe was trained in nuclear physics and mathematics (M.S.) and was the recipient of a National Merit Scholarship and a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship.

FRANKLIN PATTERSON teaches political science at the University of Massachusetts, where he is Boyden Professor of the University and Director of the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest. He served as interim President of the University in 1978, was the founding President of Hampshire College (1965-1971), and has written widely on issues in higher education. His *Colleges in Consort* (1974), a national study of interinstitutional cooperation, and *The Making of a College*, containing the master plan for Hampshire, are representative works.

Dr. Patterson was educated in California and holds the Ph.D. degree from Claremont Graduate School, whose faculty in 1980 awarded him its Citation of Merit for extraordinary leadership in higher education.

RICHARD RICKARD is the present Director of the School-College Articulation Project in Ohio. Since 1979, he has been an Associate in Instruction in English at Kenyon College, and an instructor in English, grades 7-12, with the University School in Cleveland, Ohio, where he chairs the English Department.

Mr. Rickard received a Master's degree in English from Columbia University. Following further graduate study at Case-Western University and the University of North Carolina, Mr. Rickard attended St. John's College where he received a Masters degree in Liberal Education. He has been an essay reader for the College Board Educational Testing Service and is currently a member of the advisory committee of the Literature Achievement Test and a consultant for the Advanced Placement English Test with the College Board.

ARNOLD SHORE earned his doctorate in sociology at Princeton University. He served as Director of the Commission on the Future of the College, a study and planning group at Princeton, while at the same time he directed a sociology group studying the negative tax experiments conducted by Mathematics, Inc. Dr. Shore joined Russell Sage Foundation as a Program Officer and left as Vice President. He currently works with the Exxon Education Foundation.

MICHAEL TIMPANE is the Director of the National Institute of Education. Dr. Timpane formerly served with the Washington office of The Rand Corporation, where he was a Director of the Center for Educational Finance and Governance which concentrated on the federal role in elementary and secondary education. He was also the principal investigator of Youth Policy in Transition for the Rand Corporation. Dr. Timpane previously served as Director of Studies for the Aspen Institute of Humanistic Studies Program for Education in a Changing Society.

A graduate of Catholic University in Washington, where he received his B.A. in History and Economics and his M.A. in Economics, Dr. Timpane also received an M.P.A. from Harvard University. He is the author of numerous articles and reports including most recently "The Fruits of Educational Research: An Optimist's Perspective," a chapter on *Problems in American Social Policy Research* (Cambridge, 1980).

TOMMY M. TOMLINSON is a Senior Associate in the Office of Special Studies at th National Institute of Education (NIE) in Washington, D.C. Upon completion of graduate training in clinical psychology at the University of Wisconsin, he joined the faculty of the Department of Psychology at UCLA. While there he was a member of an interdisciplinary team which carried out a landmark study of the Los Angeles riot of 1965, and in 1970 he received the Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize for his monograph on militancy and urban disorders.

In 1967 Dr. Tomlinson joined the Office of Research at the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C. and over the next five years completed his work on civil disorders and initiated studies of psychological factors in poverty. This line of research included participation in the first income maintenance (negative income tax) experiments, the Michigan longitudinal study of

families in poverty, and the development of the original federal experiment in *Black Capitalism.*

In 1973 he joined the NIE as the Assistant Director of Research and during his tenure at NIE has multiplied his eclecticism through participation in the development of the program in Law and Education, the design and production of the National Conference on Achievement Testing and Basic Skills in 1978, the development of a program on competency testing and standards and criteria of educational competence, and finally in his current position as equal parts analyst, critic and social scientist whose current "special study" is the translation of the literature about school effects and effective schools.

EDWIN WEIHE is Dean of Matteo Ricci College of Seattle University, and served as its first Director when the program was initiated in 1975. An easterner from Washington, D.C., Dr. Weihe received his B.A. from Brown University, and M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Iowa. His graduate work was interrupted for three years while he taught in Holland and in Paris, France. He has been at Seattle since finishing his Ph.D. in 1972. Dean Weihe is an Associate Professor of English with a concentration in 20th century fiction.

ALBERT T. YOUNG, JR. is currently Acting Deputy Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation's Directorate for Science Education. Since joining the Foundation in 1959 he has held a series of assignments involving science teacher training and retraining, program analysis and evaluation, and planning and budgeting for the Foundation's science education programs. Prior to coming to NSF, Mr. Young was in public school work where he was responsible for programs and services for gifted and handicapped students.

RICHARD ZAJCHOWSKI is presently the Assistant Director of DYNAMY in Worcester, Massachusetts. He served as an Academic Dean and Director of Independent Off-Campus Study, Maumee Valley Country Day School, Toledo, Ohio from 1978 to 1980, and was Director of the School-College Articulation Program in collaboration with Kenyon College. From 1975 to 1979 Mr. Zajchowski was the Director of the National Association of Independent Schools and served as a member of the NAIS Academic Committee. After receiving a Masters degree in English and American literature from the Claremont Graduate School, he taught English at the Emma Willard School, of which he is a Trustee.

PARTICIPANTS

Wallace L. Anderson
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Bridgewater State College

*Gregory R. Anrig
Commissioner of Education
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

*Jack Arbolino
Editor
College Board Review

+John M. Bahner
Director of Education
The Charles F. Kettering Foundation

Michael Bergin
Guidance Counselor
Niskayuna High School

+*Leon Botstein
President
Simon's Rock of Bard College
Bard College

+William M. Birenbaum
President
Antioch University

Everett Bray
Guidance Counselor
Amherst-Pelham Regional Senior High School

+Fred R. Brooks, Jr.
Director of Admissions
Vassar College

Bernard J. Bulkin
Dean of Arts and Sciences
Polytechnic Institute of New York

Sheila Bunton
Stamford Association for Gifted and Talented

Peter Buttenheim
Principal
Berkshire Country Day School

Leon Carlson
Norwich Senior High School

George Carow
College Advisor
The Putney School

+•Elizabeth Coleman
Dean of Freshman Program
The New School for Social Research

Margaret T. Corey
Executive Vice President
Educational Records Bureau

•Fred Crossland
Program Officer
Division of Education and Public Policy
The Ford Foundation

Ferenc Czegledy
Manhasset High School

Ann Daniels
The New School for Social Research
Yale Law School

E. Alden Dunham
Program Officer
Carnegie Corporation of New York

William G. Durden
Director
The Johns Hopkins Program for Verbally Gifted Youth

+Charles R. Eilber
Director
North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics

Jonathan Fairbanks
Ganesvoort, NY

+George Fowler
Chairman
NASSP School-College Relations Committee

Thomas E. Fox
Associate in Higher Education
New York State Education Department

Thomas E. Gee
President
Southern Vermont College

William A. Glasser
Dean of the College
Southern Vermont College

Sarah C. Godfrey
Program Associate
The Glenmede Trust Company

+•Nancy R. Goldberger
Director of Evaluation
Simon's Rock of Bard College

+Arthur Greenberg
Principal
Middle College High School

Daniel J. Griffin
Editorial Assistant
National Association of Independent Schools

+Lyn Gubser
Director
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

+Frederick Haley
Board of Trustees
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

+Elizabeth B. Hall
Founder & President Emerita
Simon's Rock of Bard College

+Livingston Hall
Secretary
Board of Overseers
Simon's Rock of Bard College

+•Eileen T. Handelman
Dean of Academic Affairs
Simon's Rock of Bard College

Mary Higgins
The New School for Social Research

+Nancy Jo Hoffman
Program Officer
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

Brian R. Hopewell
Assistant Director of Admissions
Simon's Rock of Bard College

Julia Insinger
Simon's Rock of Bard College

Daniel O. S. Jennings
Administrative Assistant
Providence Country Day School

Sara D. Jonsberg
Executive Assistant to the President
Mount Holyoke College

+•William Josephson
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

+Robert Kirkwood
Executive Director
Commission on Higher Education
Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges

Judith Kovacs
Coordinator
Program for the Gifted
Cortland-Madison BOCES

Timothy E. Laatsch
Principal
Lincoln High School

Benjamin Ladner
Executive Director
National Humanities Faculty

•Robert F. Langley
Vice President
Morgan Guaranty Trust Company

+•Janet Lieberman
LaGuardia Community College

+•Geoffrey Marshall
Director
Division of Education Programs
National Endowment for the Humanities

+•Gene L. Mason
Vice President for Development and Public Affairs
Bard College

Vincent Massaro
Dean of Administration
Antioch College

+•Warren McGregor
Principal
Manhasset High School

+•Charles Meinert
Associate in Higher Education
Division of Academic Program Review
State of New York

+•Joe Mercurio
Associate Director
Project Advance

Crystal Montgomery
Director
Upward Bound
Keene State College

Gayle E. Murney
Assistant Director
Higher Education Opportunity Program
Polytechnic Institute of New York

Douglas North
Director of Special Programs
Goddard College

+Robert J. O'Donnell
Director of Evaluation
Commission on Public Schools
National Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.

David O'Hara
Guidance Counselor
Tantasqua High School

+•Michael O'Keefe
Vice President for Policy Studies
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Theodore Andrew O'Neill
Associate Director of Admissions
The New School for Social Research

H. Jeremy Packard
Assistant to the President
Choate Rosemary High School

•Jules O. Pagano
Chairman
New York State Board of Unemployment Appeals

•Henry D. Paley
President
Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities

Helen J. Pape
Director of Professional Education
National Association of College Admissions Counselors

•John M. Paskus
Associate Professor
Department of English
Simon's Rock of Bard College

+•Franklin Patterson
Boyden Professor
Director of the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest
University of Massachusetts

•Valena Plisko
National Center for Educational Statistics

Mary Grace Poorten
City Honors High School

Phyllis W. Powell
Dean of Studies
Phillips Academy

Joel Reed
Director
University of Pittsburgh

+Richard Rickard
School/College Articulation Program
Kenyon College

Sandra Schlactmeyer
Stamford Association for Gifted and Talented

•Robert Schrank
Program Officer
Division of National Affairs
The Ford Foundation

Mark Sealy
Middle College High School

+Arnold Shore
Program Officer
Exxon Education Foundation

Bonnie Steingart
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

•Julian C. Stanley
Director of the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth
Johns Hopkins University

Bernard Steckler
Director of Curriculum Development
Matteo Ricci College-II

•Carol Stoel
Deputy Director
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

+Michael Timpane
Director
National Institute of Education

+•Tom Tomlinson
Senior Associate Office of Special Studies
National Institute of Education

•Sandy Tredennick
Executive Director
Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts

•Susan Van Kleeck
Director of Development and Public Relations
Simon's Rock of Bard College

Robert E. Walker
Headmaster
Bridgton Academy

+Edwin Weihe
Dean
Matteo Ricci College-II

Joseph L. Wood
Superintendent
Berkshire Hills Regional School District

+•Albert T. Young
Acting Deputy Assistant Director
Science Education
National Science Foundation

+Richard Zajchowski
Assistant Director
DYNAMY

+ Biographical Sketch Included
• Member of Conference Planning Committee